DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 355 HE 015 600

AUTHOR Kimble, Gregory A.
TITLE Background Materials for Chairman's Workshop. 5th Edition.
PUB DATE 15 Jul 74
NOTE 90p.; Materials prepared for workshop given by the National Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology, American Psychological Association (July 15, 1974).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; *Budgeting; *Department Heads; Departments; Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Workload; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Personnel Policy; *Psychology; School Organization; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Morale; Teacher Promotion

ABSTRACT

Information for newly appointed heads of graduate departments of psychology is presented as background material for the 1974 Chairman's Workshop. Topics include the following: the budgetary situation, pressures for increased teaching loads, effects upon recruiting faculty, faculty morale, graduate and undergraduate student morale, the intellectual situation, civil liberties, minority groups, the structure of universities, the role of the department head, strengthening the department, the departmental budget, and personal style. It is suggested that the academic world is dominated by insufficient funds to accommodate current levels of activity, much less support expansion, and a rapidly changing intellectual situation that brings special pressures for academic administration. As a result, university administrators are paying more attention to faculty productivity and workload, and psychology appears to be moving from a period of high specialization to the orientation of the generalist. Three levels of administration are considered: the upper or central administration, colleges and schools, and the department. The department head position is examined in relation to the roles of leader, manager, and passive caretaker. Additional concerns include faculty recruitment and appointment; faculty development; salary recommendations; and teacher promotion, tenure, and dismissal. Appended materials include a sample constitution, procedures for reappointment and promotion, and university standards on personnel action. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224355

BACKGROUND MATERIALS FOR CHAIRMAN'S WORKSHOP, 5th EDITION

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF GRADUATE DEPARTMENTS OF PSYCHOLOGY,

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (JULY 15, 1974).

GREGORY A. KIMBLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gregory A. Kimble

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE015 600

Preface

This fifth edition of background materials for the Chairman's Workshop was developed as previously with the aid of materials submitted by members of the National Council of Chairmen of Graduate Departments of Psychology in response to a brief questionnaire. I estimate that the content is about 30 percent new to this edition. The most important innovations are an enlargement of the materials on recruiting, a brief new section on university administration and a short discussion of faculty development.

My original plan had been to enlarge the appendix containing a collection of departmental documents and I asked respondents to my questionnaire to submit such materials. As they came in, however, it turned out that they were either very similar to one another or highly idiosyncratic. As a result I ended up including just some essential ones from the University of Colorado.

I wish to thank members of the National Council for the essential help in providing the raw materials out of which this interpretive summary has been constructed. The unacknowledged quotations are from these respondents. Very special thanks are due Sue Reissig who typed the manuscript and managed the details of the project.

Gregory A. Kimble
Boulder, Colorado
July 15, 1974

An Apology to the Women

During the five years in which these materials have been developing the world has changed faster than my style of writing has. I refer of course to the fact that this document uses the word Chairman and masculine pronouns more than it should. Newly written materials minimize such usage but it persists in those retained from previous editions. If time had allowed I would have edited these sexist expressions out of the manuscript but the task is greater than you may realize. One of the most powerful testimonies to the insidious character of sexual discrimination is the extent to which it inheres in linguistic custom.

So please accept my apologies and try not to let my ingrained habits of expression detract from your acceptance of the content of this book. I think that the advice I have to offer is gender-free. If I do a sixth edition of these materials I promise that the manner of presentation will be gender-free as well.

GAK

Table of Contents

PART I OVERVIEW: A LETTER TO A NEW CHAIRMAN 1

PART II THE CURRENT ACADEMIC SCENE 7

The Budgetary Situation 7
Pressures for Increased Teaching Loads 9
Effects upon Recruiting 11
Recruitings Hidden Agenda 12
Problems of Recruiting 13
Faculty Morale 15
Graduate Student Morale 16
Undergraduate Student Morale 17
The Intellectual Situation 18
Civil Liberties 19
Minority Groups 20
The Emergence of a New Formalism 21

PART III UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION 23

The Structure of Universities 23

PART IV THE ROLE OF CHAIRMAN 30

Leader, Manager or Passive Caretaker? 31
Faculty or Administration 33
The Chairman's Work 34
Recruiting 34
The Mechanism of Appointment 39
Faculty Development 40
Faculty Evaluation 41
Getting your Recommendations Accepted 44
Budget 47
Finding Time for Scholarly Work 52
The Chairman's Style 54
Conclusion: A Toast to the New Chairman 57

APPENDIX: SOME USEFUL DOCUMENTS 58

PART I

OVERVIEW: A LETTER TO A NEW CHAIRMAN

Dear Colleague:

So they finally persuaded you. Congratulations and comiserations! The decision to become a chairman is one that will sometimes mean great satisfaction to you; it is also a decision that you will sometimes bitterly regret.

Whatever made you do it? You are at the peak of your career in research and the chairmanship will seriously cut into your time for that. You enjoy teaching but you will be doing less of it now and in what you do you are apt to be less effective than you once were. Unless you are very unusual your new job will so occupy your time and you'll get out of touch with your field and the strains of the position are apt to show up in your lectures. You have almost no administrative experience and bookkeeping is a mystery to you. You are a peaceful man, almost afraid to deal with personal conflict. But as a chairman you will have to cope with it on a daily basis. Whatever made you do it?

Actually I don't expect an answer to the question of why you took the job. In six or seven hundred replies in the materials I have received over the past five years in preparing for the New Chairman's Workshop, I have obtained very few insights into the motives that lead one to become a chairman. Those who made relevant comments at all seemed to regard their becoming Chairman as the product of a moment of madness. And a few of them resigned within a year or so to regain their sanity. I suppose that one reason for taking the job is just to find out whether you can do it. Unfortunately there is no real way for you to find out without giving it a try. If you find out that you can't at least you will be able to retire from the position shortly relieved of whatever the urges were that got you into it.

So far this has been too vague to be helpful. Thus, I will take advantage of the ofty perch to which I have ascended with six years experience and pronounce for you the essential lessons I have learned. (What follows is partly from an anonymous "Exchange of Letters", that appeared in The Physiologist, 1968, 11, 58-62. Some of it comes from a letter from Joseph E. McGrath at Illinois).

Lesson 1. A department chairman must be prepared to budget between one-fourth and one-half of his time for the totally unexpected. He must be able to respond cheerfully and without annoyance to calls for a variety of services. He must be able to switch back and forth from the unexpected to the routine without clashing mental or emotional gears.

Yesterday was typical. In the course of the day, I (a) received a call from an irate parent about what he took to be inappropraite content in a course taken by his daughter, (b) talked to a secretary who was dissatisfied with her salary increase, (c) listened for the umpteenth time to a story of personal friction in the departmental shop, (d) had coffee with former student who was passing through town and stopped in to see me, (e) after a phone call, tried to find out what had happened to a questionnaire that never was returned to a local minority student organization.

What is most frustrating is that such interruptions have a nasty way of happening just when you think you have caught up with the job and have settled down to read an article or to work on a manuscript.

Lesson 2. You will find, as department chairman you have so much hidden power that you don't need the overt power expressed in bossing

people. This comes about in two ways: First you are the channel through which information flows to the top. I make a practice of feeding the dean a steady stream of tidbits about departmental activities. These help in forming decisions about budgets, promotions and so on. Second you are the only one who thinks five minutes ahead for the department. You will have to worry about a great many problems, and the fact that you have thought ahead and have solutions at least tentatively formed will go a long way toward making your decisions the ones that are accepted.

Lesson 3. Your power outside the department is probably greater than you think. If the university administration asks you to take courses of action that you think are ill-advised (e.g. giving up some of your space to another department) you can often say no and make it stick. If you discover that you lack this power, I think that you also will have discovered something either about yourself or your situation to indicate that you and the chairmanship do not go well together.

Lesson 4. In important matters never do today what can be put off 'til tomorrow. Maybe you'll be smarter tomorrow. In any event you will have had time to think things over. Moreover many of your problems will not really be yours and by tomorrow someone else will have handled them. If the problem comes from the Administration they may change their minds before tomorrow and the problem will go away.

Lesson 5. In your dealings with everyone, guard your reputation for candor jealousy, so that what you say counts when you want it to. For example, do not pretend in the presence of the Dean, that your most worthless faculty member is actually making a superb contribution. Save such recommendations for the man who really is doing an outstanding job.

With your colleagues don't hold back information unless you must. Except for salaries and other matters related to personnel there is very little information that needs to be kept back from anyone.

Lesson 6. Do your homework thoughly. In the academic world discussions of programs and proposals are usually marked more by opinion than evidence. Be an exception to that rule. Know what it costs to carry out your programs; know what it would cost to carry out alternatives. Have course enrollments at your finger tips. If you have facts and no one else does, you will often get your way when others can't. Quick wits, a good memory, ability to think on your feet, frankness and modesty, plus a great deal of hard work, will see you through.

Lesson 7. No one should expect a department to be one big happy family. No matter what the quality of the faculty, it will certainly be full of conflicts. However, if the leading men are really big men, they will submerge their differences for the good of the common enterprise. There is no rule that says that you have to like a man to cooperate with him.

Keeping your distance socially helps too.

Lesson 8. Make decision processes as explicit and as public as you can. It is trust in the fairness of the process, not necessarily universal acceptance of the decision, that makes the system work. Especially in dealing with conflict it is important to have machinery available to help you avoid giving an impression of whimsical, personal decisions.

Lesson 9. Be clear on your goals for the department. A degree of specialization develops in all departments. Since you cannot represent every nook and cranny of knowledge in your programs, be sure that new programs, faculty appointments and curricular changes make sense in terms of long term objectives. Don't let immediate convenience or pressures from highly regarded faculty push you into moves that are ill considered.

Lesson 10. Delegate as much as you can. Exactly what you delegate may be your biggest problem. Give it some serious thought. But you must delegate some things. Whatever your decision in this regard, be careful to give your associates the authority that goes with the delegated responsibility. Otherwise you will find yourself doing the job yourself.

Where you can't delegate seek advice. Faculty members are smart and they can be helpful. But more than that they have an insatiable need to be consulted. And all of them have it. Try to spread such requests around so that everyone is consulted from time to time.

Lesson 11. Take stock of your personal resources and values and decide where you want to devote your energies. You have the responsibility of making up your mind what you want to do with your life. You cannot be a full-time administrator, a full-time researcher and a full-time teacher, all at the same time. Give up something.

Cling to your outside interests whatever they are -- anything from art to zen meditation. Your world is about to become disorganized and distorted. You need something to help you keep your perspective and to maintain contact with the normal course of human events.

Lesson 12. Prepare for your own demise as chairman. If you do more than a custodial job as chairman you will inevitably make mistakes, hurt people's feelings, discriminate against the incompetent and offend the upper administration in your insistence that they support departmental goals. The aftermath of all of this accumulates and will tend to make your job more and more difficult. I think of myself as having a certain number of chips that I must spend with the administration and with my faculty to pay for the lines of action they dislike. Eventually that

supply will run out. The only question is the question of time. Before the inevitable happens, make plans for an orderly transition of leadership.

I doubt that I have been of much help to you with all this pontification but I have done my best. The last lesson I could give you is in a way the most important but probably the most useless of all because there is not much you can do about the problem. Be prepared for the emotional toll the chairmanship will take. Anxiety about the job is normal and sleepless nights will probably happen now and then. I suppose that my advice would have to be to live with it for a while. If you find you have developed a low threshold for a reaction of righteous indignation you'll probably make it. If your low threshold turns out to be for feelings of guilt or apathy, or if you find yourself making an adjustment in the form of vacuum activity called paper work, QUIT.

Yours,

Gregory A. Kimble

PART II

THE CURRENT ACADEMIC SCENE

The academic world these days is dominated by two powerful forces, insufficient funds to accommodate current levels of activity, much less support expansion, and a rapidly changing intellectual situation that brings very special pressures to bear on academic administration.

The Budgetary Situation

All universities have come to depend to an important extent upon Federal funds for the support of their programs. In some universities such monies may constitute as much as 40-50% of the budget. Now the nearly total disappearance of these funds has become a grim possibility, and severe cutbacks have occurred across the board. Prospects for recovering our losses of outside support are gloomy.

Legislators who provide the funds for state universities have shown little enthusiasm for providing increased budgets. They have responded to our problems with an attitude that falls somewhere on the dimension from apathy to antipathy. Status quo budgets and even reductions have been the result. The private universities are beset with problems that are at least as difficult. Endowment income will not stretch to cover operating expenses. Alumni have cut back on contributions. Tuition increases do not keep pace with increased costs of eduction.

To make things worse student enrollment is dropping in many universities. What makes this serious, particularly in public universities is that budgets are usually tied to enrollment in some way. If enrollments decrease formula exist that demand reductions in number of faculty. As a result, faculty, including tenured faculty, have been dismissed and hiring new faculty has

A Two-Track System? The difficult job situation has led at least a few departments to consider a possible way to retain faculty who might be dismissed under most current departmental policies. This would be to create two different tracks to tenure, one through research, the other through teaching. Although this solution has a certain human appeal it has been rejected by every department that has reported considering it, for the following reasons: (1) It would create a condition of second-class departmental citizenship for those on the teaching track. (2) Research is of the essence in the traditional conception of a university. A faculty member who does not do research should find a position in a teaching institution. (3) Given the job market it is possible to find people who are good teachers and good researchers. To maintain quality these are the people we should be hiring.

Graduate Student Morale.

The insecurities felt by junior faculty members are also a concern of the current group of graduate students. In fact, their situation may be even more difficult because they appear increasingly to doubt the general sense of what they are doing, as well as to have a realistic worry about getting a decent job if they persist in their graduate program. Maybe the source of the general concern is the specific one: "How can what we are doing be of value when there is so little demand for us?" However that may be, there are many reports of alienated graduate students who reject academic as well as cultural values, of "clinical students whose appearance and demeanor would surely terrify a client," and of other students who are ready to chuck it all and enter some other line of work.

One very common result of this general dissatisfaction has been a demand on the part of graduate students for greater participation in departmental affairs, a demand to which departments have usually acceded.

become impossible. The establishment of new programs of instruction and research has become extremely difficult.

In many ways an even more frustrating consequence of the budget crunch has been a sharp decrease in flexibility. Temporary freezes on the hiring of faculty and other personnel have been very common during the past several years. The apparent reason for this has been that budgetary decisions have been difficult to make at the upper administrative levels. To take an important example of what has been happening, personnel paid for on soft money posed this kind of problem: Federal funding of grants is usually late these days and there is always the possibility that approval will not be forthcoming even of applications for previously awarded continuation funds. If such money does not become available, the salaries of tenured faculty members temporarily paid on training grants, for example, will suddenly become the responsibility of the university. This prospect makes it impossible to commit money to replace departing faculty because the funds might be needed to pick up soft money positions. This led to the so-called "freezes".

In the meantime, psychology courses have become enormously popular. In a situation where total enrollments are holding constant or even decreasing, psychology enrollments have skyrocked. Over a three-four year period a fairly common pattern has been for numbers of psychology enrollments and majors to triple. The same thing happened to applications to graduate school. There are signs that this rapid growth is nearly over. Probably several factors are contributing: decreasing university enrollments in general, the fact that there is a "saturation point" which limits the number of enrollments in any field, the enormous difficulty encountered by students in getting into graduate school in psychology and an increasing

attractiveness of curricula in biology, environmental design, pre-law and so on. In any event, it looks as if the period of rapid increase is nearly at an end. This means that you should be planning now for what several of my correspondents have referred to as a "steady state" enrollment situation or even a decreasing enrollment. If this is so it should be somewhat easier to cope with a number of problems that were difficult in times of rapid increases in enrollment.

Pressures for Increased Teaching Load.

Particularly in popular fields course sizes have grown disgracefully large. Everyone is unhappy about this but only two undesirable solutions seem possible: (1) Increase faculty size. Money does not exist for this solution in many places. Moreover faculties have already outgrown available space and support almost everywhere. (2) Increase teaching loads. The disadvantages of this solution are obvious but it seems likely that some increase will be forced upon us. I regard this solution as reasonable in the case of some faculty but unreasonable as a general solution. The chairman's problem is to develop ways to improve the enrollment picture without sacrificing scholarly values.

A part of the problem results from the fact that the past decades have seen a not very subtle shift in the definition of "standard" faculty work loads that must be recognized and faced. At one time the typical teaching load was 9 or 12 hours for everyone. Later on this load was reduced specifically for administrative responsibilities and research. In this way the relatively standard load became 6 hours. When we hired new people most of us emphasized the importance of research and younger people were automatically granted the reduction in teaching hours to allow for research. A few generations of this practice is what led to the redefinition. Now

the standard load is 6 hours with research being something that the faculty member does if he has time and feels like it. Some don't and more sensitive evaluations of faculty productivity are certain to make our situation look worse instead of better because of the considerable frequency with which faculty can be identified who do their six hours of teaching and little else. Partly for this reason it seems certain that these pressures for increased teaching loads will continue.

I suspect that the pressures can be resisted if the chairman faces the issue in terms of reality. A first fact that needs to be considered is the job situation in most academic disciplines. Although the situation in psychology is less difficult than in the more basic sciences, the fact is that finding an appropriate position in psychology is difficult. Because of this a good many departments have begun to cut back on their graduate programs. Probably more of us should be doing that. As a result of these decreasing enrollments there should be a decreasing need for graduate courses. If individual faculty were to shift from a 50-50 split between graduate and undergraduate teaching to a 25-75 split <u>even in alternate years</u>, this would be enough to solve the problem in many universities. Another possibility that we should all consider is that some minor tinkering with the curriculum could have beneficial consequences. If a few undergraduate students can be enrolled in your graduate courses you will be able to continue to give them. This may salvage your graduate program and even strengthen it. The experience of most of us has been that our best undergraduates are better than our average graduate students.

A similar possible mechanism for improving the enrollment situation results from an opinion of mine that large lower division courses taught by excellent people can be very effective and may provide a way of reducing

enrollments in upper division courses. I doubt that definite recommendations are possible because they will depend so much upon individual programs. In most places, however, there will be ways to renumber courses, rethink requirements and adjust course limits so that the pattern of enrollment is more attractive than it is now. Such moves may serve to forestall requirements of teaching loads so heavy that they would interfere with the scholarly functions of your faculty. This, incidentally, is one of the places where I would simply refuse to go along with such a requirement and see if you can get away with it.

A final fact to face is that not all faculty members are equally effective in research. In times of good support it was possible to ignore such differences and allow the unproductive individual to carry the same teaching load as everyone else. Now, however, I suspect that the time has come to take a hard look at faculty accomplishments in all areas and to require the faculty members who do little or no research to teach more than their more productive colleagues. There are, of course, individuals for whom this solution is unattractive because their teaching is no better than their research. Such people pose the chairman with some of his toughest problems, particularly when they are tenured. No viable solutions appear to exist.

Effects upon Recruiting

Administrations have clarified an important point in recent years and have arrived at the conclusion that faculty slots do not belong to departments. When a resignation or retirement occurs, the position thus vacated becomes a University position to be filled where the need is greatest. By this logic, psychology departments usually can make a case for additional faculty. There is a parallel clarification involving an important distinction that the chairman should understand. Whereas we think of appointments

in terms of "slots", university administrators think in terms of dollars. They have to because that is the way their budgets come, except in a few cases where a state legislature has line-by-line (that is position-by-position) power over the budget. This means then that the replacement of a $20,000 full professor with a $10,000 assistant professor will release funds to pay the entire salary of a second assistant professor. As a result of such considerations most recruiting these days is for people at a junior level. Similar considerations apply with respect to secretaries, shop personnel, research technicians, animal caretakers and janitors.

In this connection, there is a point about minority-group faculty to keep in mind. They receive higher salaries than other faculty and, seen in terms of dollars, hiring a minority faculty member could conceivably affect the income of every other member of the department. The chairman should argue for special appropriations, that sometimes can be obtained through minority-group programs, to pay the difference between a minority-group salary and a usual one.

Recruiting's hidden agenda

Since we usually can make a case for needed faculty a good many psychology chairmen report each year that they were allowed to add faculty to their rosters in order to meet commitments to undergraduate teaching. Of these, a substantial fraction regretted it later. The problem is that the additional faculty require additional secretarial help, supplies, research space, and office space, all of which may be harder to acquire than the new faculty member was in the first place. Sad experience has now shown a few departments that hiring an animal caretaker, another secretary, additional shop personnel or getting a better bookkeeper might well have done the department more good than adding a faculty member.

If you decide that adding faculty is necessary and/or desirable the problem of support is something you should consider at the time of recruiting. Since deans are human they are apt to be more willing to make concessions in the area of support at the time of hiring than they will be later. In discussions with prospective faculty I make it a point to get a realistic statement of needs for equipment and supplies and include a provision for them in my offering letter. If the Dean is willing to put his OK on the letter this commits him to such support. If he cannot make such a commitment you may be better off without the new faculty member. Under such circumstances, however, you had better begin to consider cutting back on the size of your program.

Problems in Recruiting

The circumstances surrounding recruitment have been chaotic in the past few years and there is little prospect of a change for the better. The reason for this is fiscal uncertainty. Several chairmen have described similar sequences of events: First they thought they had a job to fill. Then it disappeared because of some other demand on the university budget. Then the position materialized again, but now it was too late to do a responsible job of recruiting. In particular they found it impossible to meet open advertising procedures required in affirmative action programs. A couple of chairmen had useful advice to offer at this point. One was to do preliminary advertising for jobs and screening of candidates on the basis of just a possibility, so that if a position becomes available, you are able to fill it. Otherwise, you may lose the chance to add faculty to some more enterprising chairman: "In my experience, if you're not ready with a live candidate, you can't compete."

The second bit of advice was to offer an initial one-year appointment if you recruit too hastily. This will identify the position as a reality where it counts most -- in the university budget. At the same time, it prevents your making a long-term mistake. Unfortunately, the tight job market in certain areas of psychology has produced a new problem in the area of recruiting. Several chairmen, for example, complained about the enormous gap between the actual quality of many applicants and the strength of their recommendations. ("We had 650 applicants for a job and most of them could walk on water.") If a department is misled into making a mistake for this or any other reason, a short-term appointment can be terminated much less painfully than a longer term appointment that has given the individual time to make friends in the department and to begin to sink roots.

Incidentally, in connection with recruiting, be sure that you bring your negotiations with every candidate to some final and formal conclusion. Don't leave a new Ph.D. sitting somewhere waiting to hear from you. This has been made more difficult to accomplish in recent years with the institution of policies of open advertising of jobs. I have received numerous reports of a thousand applications for a single position. The paper work and costs resulting have become an impossible burden in many departments. Even those who have tried to cope have slipped up too often and have received many angry letters from applicants wanting to know "whatever happened to the job you were considering me for?" With an increasingly difficult job situation, it may be important to develop some centralized mechanism for processing applications. As things stand now some chairmen are considering returning to the old "buddy system" of recruiting, whatever the consequences.

Faculty morale

In terms of sheer number problems with money are first in the list of those that bedevil the chairman. Problems of faculty morale are clearly in second place in terms of number, and probably first in terms of the agony involved. As one chairman pointed out, in pressure-laden times like these, almost any issue can polarize a department and lead to divisive friction. There are certain sources of trouble that seem nearly universal.

A Pervasive Insecurity. The situation in the job market has produced a real (and realistic) fear in young faculty members that their jobs are in jeopardy. In some, this leads to a healthy attention to the matter of doing as good and responsible a job as they can, but in others the effect has been demoralizing. One result of this in a few universities has been the unionization of faculty. The consequences in these cases seem uniformly to have been bad. The most serious effect has been that union policy prevents the use of merit as a basis for differential salary recommendations, a policy that seems guaranteed to engender mediocrity.

In other places, the problem arising from this feeling of insecurity has focused on the evaluation of faculty. These evaluations always represent a sensitive area, but the difficulties seem now to have multiplied. I shall have more to say about faculty evaluation later. In the meantime there is one particular consequence of the tight-money situation to mention here. As faculty mobility has decreased and as the quality of new faculty available has increased we seem to be entering a situation where younger faculty members catch up with an pass their older colleageus very quickly. If your salary setting procedures recognize excellence (they should!), this will mean greater increments for younger faculty than older ones with a consequence loss of morale there.

Previous reports, without exception, pointed to the success of this administrative innovation. Recently, however, a new and disturbing note has appeared in responses to my questionnaire. Serving on reappointment commitees, graduate students in some cases have not had the courage to make a negative recommendation, knowing that this could leave a faculty member without a job. Usually they have had the responsibility of making a recommendation in the area of teaching and research supervision. In two cases, chairmen report the reappointment of a very junior faculty member largely on the basis of such a recommendation, only to discover later that the man was actually quite ineffective. It seems clear that no important judgment of this type should be left solely to the student members of a committee.

Undergraduate Student Morale

Where they are taking palce, cutbacks in the size of graduate programs are beginning to have a positive effect on graduate student morale. Fewer students completing the Ph.D. degree means a better chance of getting an appropriate job and a happier consequent frame of mind. The cost of this improvement in the situations of graduate students is demoralization at the undergraduate level, however. Getting into graduate school, particularly in clinical psychology, is difficult. Although hard data are difficult to come by (Available numbers are contaminated by multiple applications and there is operational ambiguity about the meaning of the term, "application") an estimate is that the odds may be 10 to 1 against getting into a graduate program at all and 50 to 1 against getting into the very best programs.

These grim statistics are taking their toll in terms of undergraduate morale. Even the chairman, who tends to be out of touch with undergraduates, will encounter many who are discouraged, frustrated and at loose ends in

the last semester of their senior year. They have been turned on by our field but turned down by every graduate school they applied to. About all you can do to be helpful is to get the message to these students early. Programs of advising need to be strengthened and getting advanced undergraduate students in to the picture can be helpful.

The Intellectual Situation

In the area of intellectual concerns there are two important trends to be noted, one briefly. That is that psychology at least appears to be moving from a period of high specialization back to the orientation of the generalist. By and large this trend seems beneficial. Faculties seem to be working together with greater harmony than they did even a few years ago. There is a greater interest in the work of others than was once the case. For you as a chairman there are a couple of practical implications of this point.

One is that the most marketable students these days appears to be those with fairly broad training. Although I do not wish to make curricular recommendations it may be important for you to take a hard look at your graduate curriculum to make sure that you are doing as good a job as you can of turning out people with more than specialized interests in just one limited field.

The other point is that the past decade or two have established faculty habits of isolation that should be broken if broader training and greater intradepartmental communication seem important in your setting. Probably solutions will vary from department to department. Team teaching and joint seminars are one possibility. At Colorado we have used a faculty colloquium series to this end. We schedule a meeting of the entire faculty every Monday throughout the year. Departmental meetings occur on Monday once a month. On other Mondays there is a colloquium either by an outside

invited speaker or a member of our faculty. In the latter case we made one innovation that was very useful. The identity of the faculty member giving the colloquium was a carefully guarded secret until his introduction. Just preventing selection of which colloquia to attend in this way improved attendance and fostered intercommunication in a most effective way. Other chairmen report improved faculty communication by the establishment of regularly scheduled coffee hours and through the use of a periodic (or aperiodic) newsletter.

Civil Liberties

The second major theme referred to above is an increased sensitivity to the demands of students and society for relevance, meaningfulness, and regard for human rights. Because they are intangibles the problems arising are difficult.

Action vs. Scholarship. The chairman who put this problem most succinctly referred to "younger faculty who confuse civil liberties with academic values." As this theme has developed it has become clear that a part of student dissatisfaction derives from a rejection of scholarly values. Many students seem to take the position that it is necessary only to feel the right emotions with respect to important issues. To think about these issues, to subject them to analysis, to consider the possibility that a distasteful answer to a question (e.g. inherited racial differences in intelligence) could possibly be the truth: all of this some students find offensive.

In recent years this reaction has come to a focus on three general topics of concern to psychologists: The use of psychological tests, the genetics of intelligence and behavior modification. With some frequency classes have been disrupted by gangs of protesters. Faculty members who discuss these issues should be aware that there is more than a slight probability of their being subjected to some pretty abusive practices.

Those who have handled these episodes successfully appear to be those who have kept their cool, remained objective and refused to participate in a harangue at the level of the protesters. In these cases level headed students have often come to the aid of the professor.

Where the chairman is apt to be drawn into the fray is in the form of demands that certain professors be fired because of what goes on in their classes. What is at issue is academic freedom in the most obvious sense of that concept. It is up to the chairman to back the faculty member, cooly and objectively, if possible.

Minority Groups.

The commitment of most universities to the appointment of minority group faculty and students has led to several problems:

(1) In the case of faculty, the biggest problem is that qualified minority group people are scarce. When located, they command salaries that are at least 10% to 20% higher than normal.

(2) Except in the case of women, qualified minority group graduate students are also hard to find and poorly qualified ones have been admitted. The pattern of minority group programs is similar in many universities. It involves (a) relaxing admission standards for Black and Mexican-American students. Specifically this tends to mean disregarding the GRE in admissions, (b) a commitment to affirmative action programs to proportional representation (e.g. 20%) of minority group graduate students and (c) a commitment to the student of two years (rather than one) of financial backing during which the hope is that deficiencies in the student's preparation can be corrected. It is still too early to evaluate these programs.

(3) A third set of problems arises from the characteristic operating style of radical groups. Two or three chairmen advocate unusual care in

dealings with minority groups. Small issues have been magnified and major ones have been distorted.

(4) The amount of paper work that has to be done in minority program accounting is enormous. You will be asked to identify minority faculty, indicate how they are paid, describe programs of affirmative action, defend the hiring of a non-minority faculty member, account for differentials in pay, if they appear to exist, and so on. There is no way to avoid these chores. One thing you can avoid, however, is weakening your faculty through reverse discrimination. Although you may have to counter some pretty exotic arguments it is usually possible to stick to the criteria of academic excellence.

The Emergence of a New Formalism

In many cases problems stemming from disagreements in the area of Civil Liberties have ended in courts of law. Among those who have brought charges against Chairmen, departments or universities are students who have been excluded from graduate programs, students who have been dropped from programs, faculty members whose salaries are low and faculty members who have failed to gain reappointment or tenure. The chairmen who have been involved in such disputes all report them to be extremely unpleasant.

One other consequence of the social conditions that produce such problems has been the emergency of a much more formal approach to issues than was once the case in academic life. We now have formal constitutions, associated operating guidelines, formally stipulated lines of communication, definitions of who is a faculty member and who isn't and on and on.

Many of us find such formality distasteful and yearn for a return to simpler times. I doubt that it will happen, however, and suggest several lines of action for the chairman: (1) Be sure that you know how grievances are handled in your university in detail so that you will understand what is going on if you are called upon to defend your actions. (2) Develop

whatever documents you need to allow your department to function. (3) Be very careful about what you put in writing on faculty matters. You may have to defend it in court. (4) In the case of my most difficult people I have developed the practice of keeping a separate private file which includes not only correspondence on controversial matters but my own evaluations of these situations as they arise. When old sores are reopened, as they will be, this is enough to refresh my memory as to what actually happened. (5) If disgruntled faculty make outrageous and distorted statements about your function and if these statements reach the press do not respond through the media: (a) by the time they reach the daily paper, the distortions are themselves distorted and you may find yourself in the untenable position of reacting to charges that weren't made. (b) What you should do is to discuss the problem personally with the individual involved. (c) If you must react in writing prepare a dated memorandum identified as "for the file, for use when and if needed" and include it in the private file mentioned above. (d) another form of reaction that is sometimes therapeutic is to prepare as vicious a reaction as you can and then throw it away.

PART III

UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

Unless you are better at such things than I was when I became a chairman, your position in the university is apt to pose many questions, some of which can be made easier to handle if you understand at the outset some things about the makeup of your university that only gradually became obvious to me.

The Structure of Universities

Although details will vary from university to university, you are apt to find that your position is definable in terms of three levels of administration.

1. The upper or central administration. This unit consists of the President of the university and his staff, Vice Presidents, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, Provosts and the like. Your dealings with these individuals are apt to be indirect and I would advise merely trying to develop and maintain a cordial, first-name, relationship to them but not to expect them to solve your problems. Partly this is because most of your problems should be solved by the dean of your college and partly because of a type of problem with upper administrations that appears to be widespread. The "Peter Principle" is alive and well and is living in academe.

The best known aspect of the so-called "Peter Principle," as I recall it, is something like this: In administrative circles, a man rises to the level where he becomes incompetent. As it turns out, academic administrations are covered by this law. In recent years, responses to my questionnaire have contained increasingly bitter commentaries upon the functioning of

upper administrations. Such phrases as "fantastic increases in the amount of paper pushing," "tangles of administrative red tape," "unbelievable timidity and conservatism," and "a herd of Nervous Nellies" were liberally sprinkled through the responses to my Problems question. Beyond this a major activity of an occasional chairman has been in connection with a faculty coalition working to get an administrator dismissed.

What seems to have happened in recent academic history adds a new dimension to the Peter Principle: In many cases, university administrators rose to the limits of their competence in a situation that existed a few years ago. Now, however, things have changed. Administrative problems are much more difficult, and these people are unable to cope. As a result, they substitute red tape for action; they dare not take even the tiniest gamble; they fail to return telephone calls and break appointments; they promise something one week and deny the promise the next; they postpone; they procrastinate; they are unavailable in situations of emergency.

In particular, this state of affairs has led to a serious problem of communication in many universities. The chairman is asked, "What is the university policy now on raises, tenure, reappointment, teaching loads, affirmative action programs, special funds for minority faculty, the unionization of academic staff?" In many cases, in attempting to get answers, the chairman will find that policy seems not to exist, and that every administrator he goes to is leaving the problem up to someone else. What this means is that the chairman must sometimes invent his own policy and take his own risks. At least the chairman can respond to issues in terms of what he will recommend. Naturally, these recommendations are going to get turned down sometimes, and ignored even more often but at least the chairman will have fulfilled his obligation to react to important questions

from his faculty. And, in an administrative vacuum, the chairman's suggestions may be the only policy extant.

What to do about the general situation? Most of the chairmen commenting on this problem seemed to think nothing but wait and hope for the best. Probably this is better advice than it sounds because of the nature of the problem. It is possible to spend a great deal of time fighting the system without any important accomplishment, and to end up feeling that you've slugged your way into the middle of a wet sponge. If you feel you must do something, there is probably no better suggestion than one the new chairman will think of himself. Immediately after an interview with any administrator, write him a brief note summarizing the agreements you believe were reached and inviting him to correct the record if you are wrong in your understanding. Get a response in writing if you can. Remember, verbal commitments are not worth the paper they're written on.

2. Colleges and schools. Almost everywhere the Department of Psychology is a part of a college of Arts and Science, Arts and Letters, Science and Mathematics, Life Science, Biological Science or Social Science. In some universities psychology is in the School of Education, sometimes as a separate Department of Educational Psychology. In addition there will be a looser association with the Graduate School.

As regards associations of the first type many universities are undergoing reorganization and you may have to face the question of the part of the university to which your department will belong. Your decision will depend in part upon the nature of your individual department and for many purposes the decision may be less significant than you think. About the only point of general significance that I can think of is that Colleges of Science usually have better equipment budgets than the others and this may influence your choice. However that works out the key administrators in

your life will be the Dean of your undergraduate college and the Dean of the graduate school. Maintaining good relationships to these individuals is essential.

In this connection a few pointers about how a Dean functions will be important. In most places he will be able to approve recruiting programs and new appointments on his own. He is probably also the person who decides whether salary increments for your department are average, less than average or better than average each year. Reappointments, promotions and tenure are another matter, however. Sometimes these actions require the approval of an ad hoc committee set up to evaluate the individual. More often, the critical committee is a standing "Faculty Affairs Committee" or "Budget Committee." This committee reviews your recommendations on these matters and then makes its own recommendation to the upper administration which almost always concurs.

3. Department. Your main responsibility of course is to your own department. You provide the most important link between it and the college administration.

Departments will have their own administrative organization. By the time a department gets to the size of 30 members or so diffusion of responsibility will begin to occur. This is the main mechanism available to you for delegating responsibility and, remember, authority.

For a department of that size you should have Directors of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies. If you can find the right person to do the job these can be the same person. A major function of such Directors is curriculum planning. There are real advantages to having the same person responsible for both. If you find this solution feasible you may want to appoint this individual as an Associate Chairman and assign other responsibilities to him--perhaps the honors program, assuming your duties in your

absence, etc. You should give careful thought, however, to what you do not wish to delegate. I shall return to this point later (p 33).

There is a small point to make about the Dean that may be of some use to the new chairman. Even more than the chairman, he tends to be the guy in the middle these days because his division of a university is usually the largest. He is required to absorb the bulk of the budget cuts imposed in the austerity programs that technically are university wide. When the students rise in unrest, they are his students. If a department recommends tenure for a weak faculty member, it is his responsibility to impose Standards. These pressures tend to put him in conflict, sometimes with department chairmen, but, in my experience, more often with his own superiors. His interests and yours will tend to be compatible more often than not. He is on your side and it is important to keep him there.

As departments grow they also tend to develop divisions along the lines of academic specialization--clinical, experimental, social and the like. Such areas usually have an individual administrator and the areas may assume responsibility for curricular matters within the specialty, selecting graduate students, search for new faculty but definitely not the final decision on appointments.

The advantages of such an organization are: 1) it provides a means whre groups with special interests can work out their problems. 2) it takes some of the load off the chairman's back. There is, however, a major disadvantage that will require your attention. This is a tendency for each training area to become a subdepartment with its own claims on space, equipment, faculty and programs of study. It will be very important for you to develop mechanisms that can bring such matters up for more general consideration as necessary. The Director(s) of Graduate and Undergraduate studies will be

key people in curricular decisions. Others may require the intervention of some departmental policy making group, typically an Executive Committee.

As your administrative apparatus grows there are two important points to keep in mind.

1. People who take on heavy responsibilities (Directors of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies, Area Chairmen) should receive some reduction in teaching load (Pp 53-54).

2. Be sure to delegate authority to act but not to establish policy (p 33). I know that I keep harping on this point but it is as significant as anything I have to say in these pages.

A good bit of what has just been covered can be summarized by presenting a fairly typical departmental committee structure such as that which appears on the next page.

SOME TYPICAL DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES

I. Committees that are usually advisory to the Chairman

A. Executive Committee - (Chairman plus elected members)

Deals with problems of general policy

B. Student Advisory Committee - (Elected or appointed graduate and undergraduate students)

Deals with educational and other problems of students

C. Personnel Committee - (Makeup varies greatly)

Makes recommendations in area of salary, promotion and tenure

D. Space Committee - Controls allocation of space

II. Committees that usually report to the entire faculty

A. Committee on Undergraduate Education
B. Committee on Graduate Education

These committees are usually chaired by a Director of Undergraduate Studies and a Director of Graduate Studies. Faculty members may be elected, appointed or hold membership by reason of another position (e.g., chairman of a training area). Students are often members.

These committees deal with problems of curriculum and often make recommendations in the area of faculty recruitment. For mutual problems they may meet jointly.

III. Training Committees

Each such committee consists of all members with primary interest in a training and/or research area (clinical, physiological, industrial, etc.). Each area is chaired by an Area Chairman. It is responsible for the <u>details</u> of the graduate curriculum in the area and works with the graduate and undergraduate committees on the staffing of courses. It recruits graduate students, manages training grants, and supervises student progress.

IV. Committees to deal with recurrent problems such as faculty awards, honors, undergraduate prizes, the departmental reading room, colloquium, minority group students, space and relationships to non-academic staff.

These "committees" are often one-man committees depending upon the magnitude and complexity of the problem.

PART IV

THE ROLE OF THE CHAIRMAN

There are a few departments in which the chairman's job is essentially custodial and of a bookkeeping nature. In these institutions the position rotates year by year and members take turns serving as chairman. The drawbacks in this arrangement are so obvious that it is rare. Clearly, it is difficult for the one-year chairman to accomplish anything rewarding. If the one-year chairmanship is a tradition or seems to make sense in your department, an arrangement recently worked out by one department sounds effective: "We have moved to a system of a Committee of Chairs consisting of a Chair-elect, Chair and Post-chair. Each spring the department elects a new Chair-elect to take office the following fall at which time the old Post-chair retires and the other two move up a peg. There is a certain amount of division of labor among the chairs; the Chair has a 9-unit reduction in teaching load (from the 12-unit standard); the other two have 3-unit reductions."

More typically the terms of chairmen tend to be three to six years, which may theoretically be long enough for a person to "build something" and to leave the mark of his administration on the department. The rate of turnover in the chairman's job suggests, however, that it may be very difficult to do anything constructive in any amount of time. A basic problem seems to be that the chairman gets so bogged down in the details of his job at the outset that he never finds time to look at the department in perspective, to decide important directions of development or to consider the future from a semi-detached point of view. I suspect that this is the major source of frustration in this particular job.

Obviously, attempting to develop a long-term plan is important. It probably would be highly desirable for a prospective chairman to spend some

time before he actually assumes his new role in developing a long-term plan and discussing it with members of the department. Some of the matters that most often seem to need thought and planning include the development of necessary additions to faculty and supporting staff, equipment, the size of the graduate program and its structure, and the number of undergraduate majors. Sometimes this analysis will reveal the existence of programs that are no longer viable. In such cases obviously, it would be desirable either to strengthen such programs or to eliminate them completely. The latter course is always painful, but some of the most successful dealings with departmental problems reported in my surveys have involved exactly this.

There are also more subtle problems that are probably more important. Is the department to have some special orientation to which the more practical items above should contribute? How is the obvious conflict between the autonomous needs of special areas (experimental, physiological, social, clinical, etc.) and the existence of the department as a coherent entity to be resolved? What stance will the department assume with respect to the relative importance of research, teaching and service in its faculty?

Leader, Manager or Passive-Caretaker?

The pressures on the universities, arising mainly from lack of money and changing social values have chrystallized a number of issues in recent years. Among these is the issue of the precise role that the chairman is to serve. Three such roles seem distinguishable: Those of leader, manager and passive caretaker. Every chairman finds himself functioning in all of these roles. It is the balance that he strikes among them that will determine his effectiveness and satisfaction with his job.

Passive Caretaker. The custodial chairmanship is probably the easiest role to slip into, but, as we have seen, the satisfactions are too few to

make it an attractive one. Moreover exclusively playing this part would work against the development of the department. All that such a chairman could accomplish on his own would be the perpetuation of old programs. Insofar as possible the caretaker role should be passed on to nonacademic personnel. Here are some caretaking responsibilities that respondents to my questionnaires have complained about, all of which in my opinion should have been turned over to a secretary: the paper work involved in keeping track of the progress of graduate students, responding to questionnaires designed to determine the status of minority group students, the details of scheduling courses, acknowledging and keeping track of negotiations with applicants for jobs (this one has, as we have seen [p. 14] become a serious problem but it should not be the chairman's problem), the paper work involved in complying with affirmative action programs. Unless you find a way to get out from under the burden of such tasks, the chairmanship will surely become a major source of dissatisfaction.

Manager. In the extreme case, my image of the Chairman as manager is that of the fulltime administrator, the man who spends his entire day working for the good of the department chiefly by serving as the link between his own faculty and the administration. Inevitably the Chairman's role takes on a large element of this managerial function. But, again, playing only this role leaves the chairman doing less than he should. Specifically he tends to devote too little time to looking ahead and planning for the department's future.

Leader. What all of this is leading up to is that the complete departmental chairman must take on the responsibilities of leadership. But now there comes a basic question: leadership in what areas? Where should he delegate?

When should he retain responsibility himself? Stuart Cook, former chairman at the University of Colorado speaking to the first Workshop for New Chairmen, answered the question this way: Whatever he delegates, the chairman should retain for himself five areas in which he should take positive leadership. They are:

1. Planning the directions in which his department will develop.
2. Developing a strong faculty
3. Managing money
4. Managing space
5. Deciding the kind of administrative work he will do.

Having decided to delegate responsibility for everything but a limited list of items at the level of policy, the chairman faces a challenge that may find hard to meet, that of delegating, in addition to responsibility the authority to make certain decisions. But you must do it. Faculties being what they are, failure to yield certain decision making power, will leave you doing everything yourself.

Faculty or Administration?

In recent years a new dimension has been added to the issues relating to the chairman's role: Is the chairman a member of the faculty or a member of the university administration? Most chairmen take the position that they belong to the faculty. They came from it and they expect to return to it. They belong there for reasons of training, commitment and established loyalties.

In a few places, emerging unionism has brought to light considerations that support this position. Unions of course, deal with management on matters of contract. If the chairman were designated as a member of the administration, he would find himself in the central position in monetary negotiations, a situation that poses problems with which he is poorly equipped to cope. This means that if unionization comes to your university you should try to

be "worker" rather than administration. In addition to negotiating problems if you become "management" the distance between you and your faculty increases immensely. Those to whom this has happened describe their situation as acutely uncomfortable.

The Chairman's Work

A grim reality that a prospective chairman may as well face at the outset is that in his efforts to build and strengthen a department he is not going to be able to rely much on changes in the behavior of existing faculty. The problems that drove his predecessor from the job will continue to exist. Old frictions will remain. The stars of the department will still be there, but so will accumulated deadwood, the non-contributors and the trouble makers. This means that much of what a chairman accomplishes will have to be through the recruiting of new personnel and encouraging their development.

Recruiting

The initial problem, of course, is to obtain permission to hire new faculty. Many chairmen discover (often in spite of informal commitments) that this is a major problem. In many of these cases something might have been accomplished if the new chairman had made the permission to recruit new faculty a formally stated condition of his accepting the job in the first place. Later on, about the only basis on which recruiting can proceed is through granting of an occasional new budget line by the administrator who controls such things. Sometimes new positions can be obtained by the "mortaging" of positions that will become available later on through retirements to produce needed increments in faculty strength. Such planning in advance also protects the department against loss of the position later on should times, or merely the university administration, change for the worse.

A special problem involves a question of the level at which new appointments should be made. Departments in search of instant reputations find the idea of appointing at least a few distinguished people very attractive. The difficulty is in finding them, and almost all chairmen who have gone this route found it a route to final frustration. Several problems stood in the way: the simple difficulty of finding distinguished men who could be interested in changing positions, the intellectual threat that having a very distinguished person poses for some existing faculty, the salary discrepancies and consequent potential frictions that are likely to result and the top-heavy quality that recruiting at advanced ranks can produce in a department. All of these factors make it possible to spend a great deal of time trying to recruit people at the "star" level without accomplishing anything. Sooner or later the chairman will probably recognize that his only option is to recruit good people at relatively junior levels and to provide them with the opportunity to do good work. Fortunately, psychology is a field that develops so rapidly that it is probably possible to develop a "star" in less time than it takes to hire one.

Make your search thorough. Recruiting procedures themselves are pretty standard. Through whatever contacts he has and through advertising (e.g. in The Monitor), the chairman or a representative develops a roster of candidates. From the most promising of these, a list of a half-a-dozen possible recruits is assembled. Then, as much information as can be obtained is collected on each of these candidates. A comparison of credentials then leads to a series of recruiting visits, and the job is offered to what appears to be the strongest candidate. If there is a flaw in this system, it appears to be that too much reliance is placed on relatively unreliable evidence; and too often background information is spotty, sometimes consisting of nothing more than a telephone recommendation by a friend of the chairman. Departments that have achieved

notable success in their recruiting efforts have concentrated much more heavily on materials of a more substantial kind. The dossiers of candidates in these departments contain a curriculum vita, copies of the candidates' publications, three or more letters of recommendation and summaries of telephone conversations. Given the importance of recruiting to the strength of a department, going to such lengths appears to be very much in order.

Possibly the greatest peril of all in the recruiting process derives from attempts of present faculty members to secure appointments for their personal friends. Particularly if the present member is a productive and highly respected scholar, his recommendation can lead to an abbreviation of the information gathering procedure and a failure to consider competing candidates. Unfortunately, men with superb academic credentials sometimes have deplorable taste in people. It should probably be a formal departmental rule that an appointment should never be made without a full-scale search for the best possible person for the job.

Recruiting visits. A recruiting visit takes more than a day in many cases. It is important to plan a schedule, to distribute it to members of your faculty, and to give a copy to the recruit--allowing him to suggest changes. The following schedule is more or less typical of one that has evolved over the years at the University of Colorado. It works well from the department's point of view as well as that of the recruit.

Day 1

7:00 p.m. arrive. Dinner on plane. Pick up faculty member A.

8:30-10:00 p.m. Dutch treat, drinks at hotel bar. All interested faculty.

Day 2

8:30 a.m. Pick up at hotel. Faculty member B.

8:45-10:00 Tour of building. Faculty member C.

Show recruit prospective office and lab space as well as shop, computer, clinic or whatever is of special interest.

10:00-12:00 Meeting with faculty in recruit's training area. I believe that a group meeting is usually more satisfactory than individual discussions. Note, however, that individual discussions are arranged by the pick-up and delivery responsibilities of several faculty.

12:00-2:00 p.m. Lunch with faculty of recruits training area

2:15-2:45 Meeting with Dean X. Faculty member D (often the Chairman) accompanies.

3:00-3:30 Free to prepare colloquium

3:30-5:00 Colloquium

5:00-6:00 Return to hotel. Faculty member E

6:00-8:30 Dinner (by invitation.) Faculty member F

8:30 -- Social, by invitation. Faculty member G.

Day 3

8:30 a.m. Pick up at hotel. Faculty member H.

8:30-9:30 Tour of community. Cover possible living quarters, shopping areas, anything of interest. Faculty member J.

9:45-11:45 Meeting with all interested faculty outside recruit's special field. Again a group meeting.

12:00-2:00 Lunch with Directors of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies, Chairman of recruit's training area and Chairman of the Department.

2:00-3:30 Meeting with interested students. (Get students' opinion as a part of the information entering into your eventual decision. It is often very revealing.)

3:30-4:30 Meeting with Chairman of department to discuss position details

4:30 Leave for airport, Faculty member J.

By the time the recruit reaches you a good many of his questions will have been answered. It pays to check, however, and to be sure that the recruit goes away with the following information.

A. Monetary

1. Salary and schedule of payment (9 or 12 months)
2. Opportunities for summer teaching
3. Fringe benefits
   a) retirement plan
   b) hospitalization and insurance
4. Moving expenses

B. Research support

1. Lab and office space
2. Support for equipment
3. Availability of graduate student assistants
4. Intramural research support programs
5. Expectations in the area of extramural support
6. Secretarial, shop, computer and other support
7. Money for travel to conventions

C. Teaching responsibilities

1. Courses
2. Opportunities to change courses, add new ones, etc.
3. Quality of students
4. Honors program or courses
5. Policy on graduate - undergraduate teaching

D. Personnel policies

1. Conditions affecting promotion
2. Expectations in the area of tenure
3. Methods of Faculty evaluation
4. Sabbatical policy and policy on other leaves of absence

E. Departmental operation

1. Structure of the department
2. Faculty meetings
3. Expectations for participation in committee work

F. The community (if recruit needs such information)

1. Public schools
2. University concert series and other amenities
3. If possible provide the recruit with
   a) map of area
   b) copy of daily newspaper
   c) copy of University newspaper

The Mechanism of Appointment

Decisions on whether or not to appoint a prospective faculty member entail a number of considerations not covered in responses to my questionnaire. Hence what follows is a statement of my own opinions.

1. Do background work thoroughly before inviting a person for a recruiting visit in order to keep the number of them to a minimum.

2. For purposes of comparison, it is probably useful to look at two people (seldom more) for a given job.

3. The decision to appoint should be made by your whole faculty, not just you or a select committee.

4. The vote to reappoint should be by open ballot. If faculty members have reservations they should "speak now or forever hold their peace."

5. Ideally the vote for appointment should be unanimous. A minority of 25 percent is probably enough to indicate a negative action.

6. Let the candidate know the results of your discussion as soon as possible.

Faculty Development

Probably the most neglected responsibility of departmental chairmen is the guiding and encouragement of the faculty they work so hard to recruit. I know that I am among the guilty and, beyond that, I do not recall a single instance in hundreds of responses to my questionnaires where another chairman has discussed the issue. As it turns out I was "developed" by Walter S. Hunter at Brown University almost 30 years ago. Since Hunter was unusually successful in his dealings with young faculty let me first list the lessons I learned from him. There were only three which as I recall came in order, about a year apart.

Lesson 1. In life, young man, there are first things and most important things. In this university the first thing is your responsibility to the undergraduate students. Fulfilling that responsibility earns for you the right to do the most important thing--research. Get your courses in shape and only then get into the laboratory.

Lesson 2. In research, ideas are more important than elegant equipment and fancy space. Clarence Graham did the work that made him a member of the National Academy in a converted coal bin.

Lesson 3. Give some thought to where you want to be five or ten years from now and turn your research in that direction. (Hunter's advice to me was to go into the field of child development--incredible foresight given that the date was 1947.)

Now some lessons of my own

Lesson 4. In your research work keep an eye on application. The psychological world is turning in that direction.

Lesson 5. Don't let the bookmen seduce you. I know that there are plenty of models in the department to suggest that writing textbooks can be lucrative. If you give a moment's thought to who these models are, however, you will recognize that their reputations were established before their scholarly careers degenerated in that way.

Lesson 6. It is important that you publish. You must do so if you are to participate in the benefits of academic life. Not only your place in the university but your self evaluation will depend on it. Numbers of publications are less important than their quality. Stick to refereed journals; the others count against you.

Lesson 7. Take on administrative responsibility slowly. Five years from now I will be calling on you for important contributions of that type. So will the central administration of the university, and I hope that you will be willing to serve. But get your scholarly feet on the ground first.

Lesson 8. Be a good university and departmental citizen. Attend colloquia. A little exposure to work outside your own field will not hurt you. Get your textbook orders in on time. Do your grading conscientiously. Treat students with respect even when you must deny requests.

Faculty Evaluation

Whether the chairman likes it or not, he must make evaluations of faculty in connection with salary recommendations, promotion, tenure and reappointment in all institutions except for a few following a normal-school lockstep type of system. It is a foolish chairman, however, who tries to make these judgments entirely on his own. The routine practice is to obtain help and advice from other faculty members, and this often includes a self-recommendation from the person being evaluated. The details of procedures vary a

great deal, however. Some departments have personnel committees that make evaluations. In others, the whole department, sometimes including students, evaluates faculty. In others, judgments of faculty at a given level are made by more senior faculty. Sometimes these evaluations are binding upon the chairman but, more often, they are merely advisory.

General procedures. Modal practice in faculty evaluation seems to be about as follows: In connection with the determination of salary increases for the following year, the chairman or a departmental committee considers the contributions of each faculty member and makes a recommendation. The faculty member may be asked to provide input to the deliberations, and the opinions of colleagues and students may also enter the picture. No matter how carefully such a method is followed, there is a serious flaw in it. There are always a few faculty members who receive low ratings and complain, with some justification, that the criteria for judging their accomplishments were not clear to them. In the face of this problem, a very, very few chairmen have hit upon a different procedure that may be useful.

The different procedure involves an agreement between the faculty member and the chairman (or the department) in the fall as to the activities with which the faculty member will occupy himself during the year. The faculty member completes an "Expected Effort" form in which he states what he intends to do during the year, thus providing a basis later on for evaluating the faculty member's actual accomplishments.

The potential values of this procedure seems enormous: (1) Most obviously, it yields an objective statement of intentions against which a faculty member's contributions can be evaluated. (2) It provides a vehicle that the chairman may use to counsel faculty whose stated plans are unrealistic. (3) It makes it possible to tailor plans to the strengths and needs of individual faculty.

Thus, one might use this evidence to decide to release a faculty member from some of his other responsibilities so that he would have time to wrap up a program of research. Alternatively, one might suggest relaxation in the area of research if other activities might benefit.

Reasonable as this procedure sounds you are apt to find faculty, particularly young faculty, resistant to it. Since these people see their jobs as in jeopardy, any procedure you institute will be viewed as an additional form of evaluation. For that reason, if you institute an expected effort procedure or even some relatively milder version of it, it will be important to introduce it very carefully. Probably the time to do that is soon after new faculty arrive in the department. Partly as a way of handling the problem of faculty development, I plan to institute a series of meetings with new people. In these meetings I will try to explain that the problem is a mutual one and that steps designed to make criteria of accomplishment explicit should be of value to both of us.

The evaluation of teaching. The most difficult portion of the evaluative procedure involves the evaluation of teaching. Student evaluations are now required in most universities but they are of limited help. At best they represent a measure of "consumer satisfaction" but fall short of providing an index of true teaching effectiveness. Three supplementary procedures appear to have value: 1) discussions with students (especially graduate students) provide special information, 2) retrospective evaluation by graduating senior majors may provide knowledgeable reports ("When I took Professor X's course I thought it was the greatest course I ever had but now I can't, for the life of me, tell you why.") 3) visits to classrooms by colleagues are becoming fairly common. If you adopt such a procedure it is important

to try to make these visits constructive and, at all costs to avoid infringing on academic freedom. A brief description of one successful program follows.

"A committee of three visitors talk over the course plan with the instructor, then visit the class, and finally tell the instructor what comments they have. This is not an evaluation, I don't even see the report unless the instructor requests that it be forwarded to me. I can, however, request that a specific person be visited again, and see the second report. The reason for this is to make the system one which improves instruction (allowing the faculty member to profit from the advice received after the first visit) and not one that puts the faculty under the gun, again. It does have the side effect of giving us something besides the student ratings to use when evaluating faculty.

The visiting committee is chosen with care. In some cases the purpose is to instruct them, not to help the instructor. For example, we now have one of our worst instructors sitting in on the classes of one of the best instructors in the same field. The point should be obvious."

Getting Your Recommendations Accepted.

Salary decisions based on evaluations of faculty will result in actions chiefly carried out at the level of the department. Reappointment, promotion and tenure, by contrast, are handled through recommendations to the Dean. With increasing frequency the chairman's recommendations are being rejected at that level. As a result of experience on a Dean's committee that handles such matters I have gained the impression that these rejections result from flaws in the recommendations of two kinds: (1) In some cases the department seems not to understand the criteria that a faculty member must meet for positive action. (2) In other cases the case for promotion or whatever is not adequately documented.

The Dean and his committee look at a hundred or so recommendations every year in a large university and get perspective on quality performance. With the job situation as it is they can insist on quality. So hard as it is, make only recommendations that can be defended. If your recommendations for what you believe to be defensible recommendations are turned down, it is essential that you discuss the reasons with the Dean. You may find out that you have been using unrealistic criteria. Or it may be that the Dean's committee does not understand the criteria that are appropriate. Get the problem straightened out in discussion if you can.

On defensible recommendations be thorough in making your case. A simple statement that a majority of your faculty voted for the person and that you concur is definitely not enough. In addition, you should include a report of research productivity, objective data on teaching, if available, opinions solicited from outside the department and outside the university and a description of the individuals contributions in the area of service.

In this connection watch out for this problem. By now you probably have appointed a minority faculty member because he was a minority person. Moreover you may very well have hired him or her under conditions that explicitly or otherwise indicated that the contribution you expected this person to make was in the area of minority group affairs. In the opinion of individuals who have faced this problem these expectations define the bases for future personnel actions in the case of these people. Bluntly, you don't hire a person because he is a minority group member and fire him for failure to publish. These cases obviously require a very special justification for positive action. Just be sure that you are consistent in your own actions. If such consistency reveals to you that you made a million dollar mistake, you can at least learn from it.

Dealing with dismissals. One implication of the materials just presented is that you are going to have to face the unpleasant responsibility of dismissing a faculty member every now and then. How should you go about it? The most constructive recommendation I can offer is to start the process as early as possible. The straws in the wind are usually there early and it is possible to consult with junior faculty early and discuss their performance. These faculty will often hate you for it but at least you can spell out guidelines early. On this basis I am slightly in favor of initial three-year appointments which will give the faculty member time to prove himself (one way or the other) and the department time to arrive at a decision based on evidence.

But this will not make the situation pleasant. The following paragraph from another chairman makes the point and offers some additional advice.

"The downright viciousness which occurs when people are let go is upsetting, but not surprising. Jobs are hard enough to get for brand new Ph.D.'s For slightly used Ph.D.'s with warranty expired!!! Since the chairman deals with a person whose back is to the wall, things get pretty tight. So, if the chairman is upset by bitter personal attacks, said chairman had better resign. The person being dropped has to either admit inadequacy or find a sinister force...and one's sitting right there in the big office. Second piece of advice...the old Kimble song.."BE OPEN". In particular, be sure that you both are and give the appearance of being eager to listen to advice on personnel matters from all your colleagues and students. This means that you spend a huge amount of time letting people tell you things you already know, but it is very important that everyone feel that they have been listened to. Finally, a refrain to the Kimble song...in your official reports be brief and to the point. If you have to tell someone they are out, do it in writing, state the expiration date of the contract, and DON'T SAY ANYTHING

ELSE. You might have to justify that letter in court. Example: A chairman at the U of X wrote a "denied tenure" letter. He typed a nice, gentle letter saying how much he appreciated the man's teaching talents, acknowledging his scholarship, etc. The chairman's intent was to soften the blow. The result.. the chairman was hauled into court, on the grounds that since the letter indicated that the chairman felt the person in question was qualified for tenure, the chairman's recommendation not to give same must have been based on personal prejudice! Of course, the chairman will win this suit, but it takes time, it takes time."

Budget

In terms of sheer frequency, budgetary problems are more important than any other the prospective chairman has to face. The reasons for this are not difficult to discover. For one thing, most of us have not been trained in the basic skills required to plan and deal with a budget which may run to several million dollars in a large department. It is probably fairly common that the new chairman does not even know the names of all of the forms and records that he is expected to keep. If he is lucky, the details of such matters can be turned over to someone else, but there will be occasions (typically, decision-making occasions) in which some understanding of the bookkeeping process will become essential. For another thing, exactly what is included in a departmental budget is much less clear than the uninitiated is apt to suppose. The budget over which the department chairman is expected to keep some kind of account may or may not include faculty and staff salaries, equipment, research grant budgets, telephone bills, maintenance contracts for office equipment, costs of renovation and a dozen others. In his first few encounters with the budget office, the chairman is almost certain to encounter a few surprises. Even when he has learned something about the items he is expected to pay for

on departmental accounts, it takes some three or four years for anyone to develop a realistic appreciation of what an adequate budget is. About all that can be said for certain is that budgets for equipment and supplies are universally too small. This is not, however, very much of an argument to use in attempting to improve the situation.

Probably nowhere in the chairman's administrative life do relationships to upper administrators count for more than they do in the case of budgetary matters. The new chairman will quickly find that in money matters he must deal with an administrator who is responsible for the budgets in several departments. This administrator has problems that are at least as difficult as those of the chairman.

In dealing with this administrator, several respondents emphasize that developing a relationship of mutual trust is important. As an aid to this it seems generally accepted that the maintenance of accurate and current records is important to make his argument for adequate funds. The chairman needs to know how much he has spent, what he has spent it for, and where the departmental budget is apt to go in the future. Only in this way can one show that the departmental budget is simply not being squandered. In this connection the records supplied by the budget or finance office are less than completely helpful. For one thing, they tend not to be current. They lag behind the present moment in terms of actual expenditures, but at the same time they reflect encumbrances that may extend to the end of the fiscal year. For these reasons, getting an accurate picture of the budgetary situation as of a given date may be much more difficult than it ought to be. It is important, however, to have such information and to have it accurate. Only by the persistent use of such evidence can one gradually convince the administration that the psychology department budget must cover more than the cost of an occasional couch and a set of Rorschach cards.

The problem is partly a problem of education. Psychology is as poorly understood by many administrators as it is by most other laymen. It is only by gradually teaching these people what psychology is and what psychology does that adequate support can be made the basis even of a realistic request.

In the continual battle for an adequate budget, four or five lines of argument seem to have some chance of being effective. One is that increasing undergraduate enrollments and, particularly, increasing numbers of majors can make a case for a larger budget. A second approach is through the use of comparative data. Under the sponsorship of the National Council of Graduate Chairmen the APA will be making an annual survey of faculty salaries, and these data can often be used to support the argument for higher salaries. A third approach is to make use of off-campus consultants. Frequently an administrator will accept the word of an outsider that certain forms of support are essential to a department when he would not accept the same argument from the chairman. A final, extreme, form of persuasion that appears to be widely practiced takes the form of a threat to resign either as chairman or as a member of the university faculty -- "brinkmanship" as one of my respondents called it. The effectiveness of this form of negotiation is hard to assess. Obviously it is a game you have to play "for keeps" if you play at all. Otherwise, after just one bluff, you find yourself in the position of another respondent who wrote: "What do I do about my budget now that the administration has found out that I really won't quit?" Even if the threat to quit is effective, it may lead to a deterioration of relationships between the chairman and his administrative superiors. Probably the long-run consequences are sufficiently likely to be negative to recommend the use of this procedure only when the situation is desperate -- when as I have said you are convinced that the situation is one that you really cannot live with.

Starting with the assumption that supplies and equipment budgets are by definition too small, the question arises as to how this budget shall be administered. Unfortunately, it is probably impossible to turn the important aspects of this task over to a non-academic employee. The problem is that, where the chairman is untrained in business matters, clerks and secretaries are untrained in academics. The result is that decisions that should hinge on academic considerations get made on the wrong basis unless the chairman or an academic delegate does the decision-making. Probably it is this fact more than any other that eats into the time of the chairman.

Partly as a way of handling these decisions some new patterns of dealing with these problems are emerging. In general they boil down to a concept of individual accountability in this area. In an extreme case, such funds were simply divided equally among faculty who were expected to use them in ways that would stretch them through the fiscal year. In other cases faculty members were asked for an estimate of their needs and funds were allocated in terms of these requests. It is not clear yet how well these schemes have worked out. The obvious dangers are: (1) Many faculty members will not be able to produce a realistic projection of needs. (2) Complete allocation of funds eliminates the flexibility that will be needed to meet emergencies. (3) Some funds will be required to meet general departmental needs and these must be considered. (4) In a large department the system would be certain to be cumbersome and probably take more to administer than it would save.

A more realistic solution may be to allocate funds to subdivisions within departments (training areas, undergraduate education, graduate education, the clinic or counseling center, the honors program, etc.) making the administrators for these functions responsible for accounting.

Some such procedure seems essential both for monitoring current expenditures and for future planning.

Another form of economizing that seems sure to be required will involve making a sharper distinction than has been necessary before between personal and departmental business. It does not seem unreasonable to require faculty and graduate students to pay for supplies and services required for such items as personal correspondence, books written for personal profit, and the operation of extra-university business. Obviously the distinction cannot be completely rigid. A scholarly book may be a major contribution to departmental purposes and may deserve support as such, and probably almost any publicational activity contributes something of this sort. But where personal rather than university gains seems likely, personal payment for costs seems appropriate.

A similar state of affairs exists with respect to activities carried out under research grants and contracts. As mentioned earlier, it is important to make sure that grant applications are written to cover the costs of research. Actually this is not hard to accomplish. It is often much more difficult to assure the expenditure of funds in the ways outlined in the application. It is often simpler and sometimes cheaper to obtain supplies, xerox copies and small items of equipment through the department. If this practice makes sense in a particular context, there is almost certainly a way to transfer funds from a research account to a departmental account. Investigators with funds available should be required to make an appropriate contribution.

Finally, economies (perhaps of considerable magnitude) can be effected by a department-wide cooperative approach to certain problems. Items that sometimes must come from department budgets include moving furniture within a building, the cost of delivering a film from the department that distributes audio-visual aids, the operation of the university mail room, losses from

the library, storage of unused equipment, apparatus repair, classroom supplies such as xeroxed copies of readings (which incidentally may well be illegal), meals consumed on recruiting visits and laundering lab coats. Each of these items will suggest ways of saving money by having students and faculty bear small burdens.

To take just one illustrative example here, the telephone budget in any department is apt to be a major item. What you will not know unless you look into it is that different telephone configurations vary enormously in expense. In one department of about 50 people it was discovered that shifting from a system where every faculty member had his phone answered by a secretary to one where he answered it himself cut $3,000 from the budget - really quite a small burden which saved funds for more important things.

Finding Time for Scholarly Work

Recruting, faculty evaluation, and dealing with budgetary problems take a great deal of a chairman's time. If there were all there were to the job, however, it would probably be manageable. What escapes any listing of definite tasks is the amount of time a chairman inevitably devotes to small responsibilities that defy classification. Anything that is at all out of the ordinary seems to be referred more or less automatically to the chairman. This includes students with complaints, outsiders with questions about the department, salesmen looking for the appropriate faculty member to contact, Deans who think they have not done their job if they raise petty questions with anyone but the chairman, stray Ph.D.s off the street looking for employment, irate parents who think that their educational dollar is being squandered, local police in search of a student on almost any pretext, etc., etc., etc.

Obviously, the chairman has to take steps to protect himself against such incursions on his time. Two such steps seem possible. One is simply to make yourself unavailable at certain times, during which you devote

yourself to scholarly activity. If you do this you will probably find that the backlog of work that accumulated while you were gone is less than you would have guessed. Some things will have been done by others and some things will have turned out not to be worth doing. The other step to take is to get as much help as possible. Two kinds of help are available. One is the delegation of responsibility to colleagues; this in all large departments leads to the development of a committee structure. The other is a heavy reliance on non-academic personnel.

In any large department these days at least one non-academic administrative assistant seems to be essential. The responsibilities of such personnel typically cover office management in all of its aspects, the hiring and firing of secretaries, recommendations for promotions and salary increases for secretaries and clerks, bookkeeping and accounting, equipment monitoring, grants management, and so on. In very large departments these tasks are sometimes the responsibility of an associate chairman, who supervises one or more administrative assistants. I know of at least one case in which a chairman in a non-psychology department seems to have lightened his load considerably through an imaginative appointment of an associate chairman. The chairman-to-be remained at another institution for two years while the routine chores of the chairmanship were handled by the associate chairman. When the actual chairman takes up his official responsibilities, these routines will be well under control and will remain the province of the associate chairman.

Major administrative responsibilities are quite time-consuming. For this reason it is common practice to reimburse major sub-administrators for their time by releasing them from some of their teaching responsibilities. A reduction of one course per year is quite typical. For the chairman the

typical teaching load is one course a semester or one course a year.

There is good reason to rotate all administrative positions in a department. Obviously, this distributes the work. In addition, it probably improves departmental morale. For some reason many academics seem to fancy themselves as administrators and it is important to let even relatively junior faculty members try their hands at administration. Beyond this, there is probably nothing like having had such a responsibility to create sympathy with the problems of the person who inherits the job. For this reason in many departments the practice is to distribute administrative responsibility widely. A typical department member may be on two or three committees, his tenure on each extending from one to three years.

A few chairmen have written to tell me that they have given faculty vicarious administrative experience by making copies of previous editions of this document available. At least it offers the faculty a glimpse at your problems. To some of them it will be quite revealing and, even if it does not provide practice in dealing with these problems, it may create sympathy for them. If you want to try this procedure you have my permission. If you have not ordered them you also have my permission to make your own copies.

The Chairman's Style

By nearly universal agreement, what makes or breaks a chairman is his manner of handling day to day relationships to personnel. By equally universal agreement, the task is not an easy one. The new chairman inherits a set of interpersonal relationships that nearly always includes elements of friction. There are ancient feuds, the frustrated aspirations of unsuccessful

candidates for the position, residual loyalties to the former chairman, and some individuals with no loyalties at all. As a result of all this, the first shock that the new chairman is in for is the discovery that he is an isolated person. There are conversations from which he is excluded and parties to which he is not invited. Obviously, he and his administration are the main object of interest on these occasions. A continuing task of the chairman is building and maintaining a position of trust.

Perhaps just because we are discussing an aspect of academic life, the key to the problem is communication. Academics more than anyone else have a desperate need for information, a need that is often coupled with overtones of paranoia. To many faculty members, the most available response in the hierarchy appears to be: "The chairman did so and so to me without consulting me or asking my advice." The chairman must be prepared for this reaction in contexts that seem to him to be completely trivial.

The solution to this problem is simple for some people and perhaps impossible for others. If you are one of those for whom it is impossible, it might be better to give up the job now. The essential answer is openness. Although the answer is simple, it entails a great deal. First, it involves the willingness on the part of the chairman to take the time required to deal with every faculty member on an individual basis. At least some chairmen find it enough to set up appointments every month or so for individual consultation. Before you rush into this cozy solution, however, note that with a 40-man faculty it might cost you a week's time every month.

A second aspect of openness is the quality of being able to spend a lot of time listening. The chairman who does so will frequently find sensible consensus which may not exactly match his offhand judgment with respect to some course of action. In that event, the chairman avoids an important commitment in some area of too little importance to warrant it. Just listening

is not enough, however. If he can bring himself to it, the chairman is well advised to let people in on as many plans he may be entertaining as is possible. If he does this early, before he has committed himself to a particular course of action, he will get all sorts of feedback and eventually a good grasp on what is possible with respect to a given departmental problem. This puts the chairman in a position of being able finally to recommend a course of action that will almost certainly be accepted. All of this may sound a little wishy-washy, but two points: (1) Obviously, no leader (except perhaps in the military) can lead his group in directions opposed to their desires as a routine thing. (2) There will be times when a problem will be important enough to buck majority opinion, but such opposition is not attractive as a way of life, and common sense dictates its avoidance except in situations that really count.

In my opinion the discussion above comes as close as one sensibly can to answering a very frequent question about democracy in the management of a department. If you consult widely before you act you will have accomplished the aims of democracy in that members of the department will have had a voice in decisions that affect them. At the same time, however, you will avoid the situation that has arisen in some departments where every trivial thing gets decided "democratically" at faculty meetings.

Conclusion: A Toast to the New Chairman

As the foregoing materials show, my surveys continue to reveal a great deal more in the way of problems than they do solutions. On the other hand, not one of my respondents indicated that he thought the job was not worth doing. It is a big job and an important one but it takes a toll in terms of scholarly productivity and physical and emotional weariness. Somehow the chairman must find the resources to deal with these problems or else within a year or two he will be among the 25% or so of our chairmen who are giving up the job. So for the new chairman I have modified the old toast: As you slide down the bannister of the chairman's life, you will find that most of the splinters are pointed in the wrong direction. May it be granted that you find somewhere in these pages or elsewhere the stuff of which to fashion a pair of iron pants. If you don't, remember in the words of one resigning chairman, "They also serve who only cut and run."

APPENDIX

SOME USEFUL DOCUMENTS

Contents

Sample constitution 59

Guidelines on various topics 68

Procedures for Reappointment and Promotion 74

University Standards on personnel action 80

* * * *

As mentioned in the Preface the documents included here are essential ones--essential in the sense that they deal with problems described most frequently by respondents to my questionnaires. They will probably not handle the detailed situation as it exists in your department but they will define problem areas that need to be considered.

The final item describing university wide procedures is included because of the fact that personnel actions are no longer exclusively departmental problems. I believe that these procedures, proposed for the University of Colorado, may be ones to recommend to your university. I think that they are excellent, particularly in their handling of feedback to faculty.

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY - SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES AND RULES

In historical tradition the rules that govern the conduct of academic man are the rules of individual scholarly responsibility. This tradition is clearly at odds with heavy codification, elaborate constitutions, and a reliance upon procedures borrowed from business or politics. Similarly, the history of the Department of Psychology at the University of Colorado is one in which the acceptance of common values, good will, and mutual trust have served to direct the Department toward the accomplishment of its goals. Open discussion has served as a substitute for formal codes and detailed statements of operating procedures. This is in the traditional spirit of university life, a spirit that must survive if universities as we know them are to survive. Accordingly, the summary of procedures and rules of this Department consists of a set of statements designed to provide very general guidelines. Specific actions are to be determined within these guidelines, by reason rather than by appeal to codified authority. In all matters the faculty's opinion is decisive.

I. The Department

A. The Department of Psychology consists of two groups:

(1) The Regular Faculty is composed of all members of professorial rank whose primary responsibilities and primary appointments lie in the Department of Psychology. In case of doubt, membership in the Regular Faculty of the Department will be determined by secret ballot and the majority vote of the Regular Faculty.

(2) The Teaching Faculty of the Department is composed of all members of the Regular Faculty plus all persons who have independent responsibilities for teaching courses in the Department. These persons may be granted Attendant Rank.

B. Members of the Department with Attendant Rank are expected to engage in instructional activities without monetary compensation over and above their regular salary, and they are entitled to all privileges available to faculty members of comparable substantive rank except on matters of personnel.

"Majority" is too weak. We will amend to require 3/4

II. The Chairman

A. The Regular Faculty shall recommend the appointment of the Chairman, who shall be elected by secret ballot and by a majority vote at a meeting of the Regular Faculty. Full and Associate Professors with tenure are eligible for the position of Chairman.

B. The functions of the Chairman shall be as designated by the Board of Regents. (Additional statements of the Chairman's role are under consideration by the Executive Committee and may be proposed later.)

III. The Executive Committee

A. The Executive Committee shall consist of four members of the Regular Faculty elected by secret ballot without respect to rank. Terms of the elected members shall be for two years, and these members shall be elected one at a time. Elected members may succeed themselves.

B. The functions of the Executive Committee shall be to assist and advise the Chairman by serving as a "cabinet." The Executive Committee will formulate policy for submission to other appropriate groups. It will advise the Chairman on actions where the application of departmental policy is not clear. It will discuss and make recommendations on proposals that initiate from any source prior to their presentation to other groups for action. It will also deal with emergencies and unforeseen problems. The Executive Committee will determine its own procedures and, at its discretion, refer problems to other committees, to the entire faculty or to specially established committees.

C. Matters to be considered by the Executive Committee may be submitted in writing to the Chairman by any member of the faculty. The request may also include recommendations on procedural matters, including the expression of a desire to present an issue to the Committee in person. The disposition of such requests will be determined by the Executive Committee itself.

D. Minutes of the meetings of the Executive Committee shall be distributed to the entire faculty. Actions of the Executive Committee recorded in these minutes may then become an item of new business on the agenda for a future meeting of the entire faculty by a request in writing

from any member of the faculty. Decisions of the Committee may be reversed by a majority vote of the faculty on the occasion of such a meeting.

IV. Personnel

The Executive Committee is to initiate, do staff work, and make recommendations to appropriate standing committees in matters of possible personnel action. The standing committees will differ depending on the nature of the personnel action. The standing committees are: for appointment and reappointment, the entire Regular Faculty; for promotion, faculty at or above the rank to which promotion would take the candidate; for tenure, all tenured members of the department. In the case of new Associate Professors, appointments with tenure require an action in stages, approval from the Regular Faculty for appointment and of the tenured faculty for tenure. New Full Professors are always to be appointed with continuous tenure. Type of ballot and proportion of votes required to carry are to be those described in the section on Faculty Meetings.

V. Faculty Meetings

A. Faculty meetings and meetings of the standing committees that deal with Personnel will be called by the Chairman, on a schedule agreed upon at the first such meeting each academic year. Subsequent announcements of such meetings, together with agenda, are to be made at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

B. Although maximum openness and informality in conducting faculty meetings are to be desired, in the case of unresolved disagreement as to procedure, the parliamentary procedure used shall be that of Robert's Rules of Order, except as otherwise specified in this summary of Procedures and Rules of the Psychology Department.

C. At all regular Faculty Meetings and standing Personnel Committee meetings a quorum shall consist of those present. Absent members may not vote by proxy. For emergency meetings it will be the responsibility of the Chairman to obtain opinions from absent faculty

and to present these opinions at such a meeting. The table below shows the type of ballot and proportion of members present and voting required to approve certain courses of action.

Type of Question	Type of Ballot	Needed to Carry
1. Elections	secret	majority
2. Decisions affecting present personnel (reappointment, promotion, tenure)	secret	majority
3. Decisions with respect to new personnel		
a. Recruiting visit	open	majority
b. New appointments	open	3/4

4. On matters otherwise not covered in this section, voting will ordinarily be by open ballot; and a simple majority will be required to carry. Any member of the faculty may request a secret ballot, however.

D. Minutes of the meeting shall be taken by a Faculty Meeting Recorder. These minutes shall be distributed to all members of the faculty, and copies shall be retained in the Departmental Office. The Departmental Office shall also retain copies of all documents relevant to these minutes, together with the minutes themselves.

We will probably amend to require 2/3

VI. Committee Structure

Graduate and undergraduate education are to be the responsibilities of the committees described in this section. Other committees may be formed and dissolved as necessary by the chairman with the advice of the exeuctive committee.

A. Graduate education

(1) The graduate work of the department will be under the administration of a Director of Graduate Studies. This position will be filled by an appointment of the Chairman subject to the endorsement of the faculty.

a. The name of the proposed Director of Graduate Studies shall be presented to the faculty as part of the agenda for a regular faculty meeting.

b. Approval of the Chairman's recommendation shall require the assenting vote by secret ballot of a majority of the faculty attending the meeting at which this action is considered.

c. The term of the Director of Graduate Studies shall be set by the Chairman. He may succeed himself. Reappointment shall be by the same procedures as the original appointment.

(2) The work of each doctoral program will be supervised by an area committee made up of the faculty of that area.

a. For each area the Chairman of the Department will appoint an Area Chairman. This appointment is subject to the approval of the area. The Area Chairman will

serve a term the duration of which shall be set by the Chairman. He may succeed himself.

b. Every faculty member will have primary membership in one area determined at the time of initially joining the faculty of the Department. The faculty member's first responsibilities for administrative duties, teaching, and research supervision will be to that area. The primary area in turn will be responsible to the faculty member for determining teaching assignments and for negotiating with the Chairman of the Department for space and other research facilities.

c. A faculty member may change primary areas by proceeding in two steps. First he will petition for membership in the proposed new area. If he is accepted by this area he may then submit his resignation to the area of present primary membership.

d. By invitation a faculty member may have secondary membership in other areas.

   i) Early in the Fall semester of each year the Chairman will provide a means by which each faculty member may designate areas in addition to his primary area in which he wishes membership. The names of individuals desiring membership in each area will be given to the chairman of each area. After discussion by the area committee, invitations will be issued to those whom the area wished to accept.

The basis for such action will be determined by each area.

ii) The area may invite faculty who do not apply for it to accept secondary membership.

iii) Once accepted by the area the privileges and responsibilities of the faculty member are the same as those of faculty members with primary membership in the area.

iv) Conflicts between areas arising from multiple membership are to be presented to the Executive Committee for adjudication.

v) Secondary membership will be for a term of one year.

(3) There will be a committee of Area Chairmen to coordinate the graduate work of the department. The Chairman of this committe will be the Director of Graduate Studies.

B. Undergraduate Education

(1) The undergraduate work of the department will be under the administration of a Director of Undergraduate Studies. This position will be filled by an appointment of the chairman subject to the endorsement of the faculty. The conditions of appointment of the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the mechanics of his appointment will be the same as for the Director of Graduate Studies.

(2) There will be a Committee on Undergraduate Education to coordinate the undergraduate work in the Department. The Chairman of this committee will be the Director of Undergraduate Studies. The Chairman of the Department will appoint members

of the Committee on Undergraduate Education. These appointments are subject to the approval of the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Executive Committee.

C. Student Participation in Departmental Committees

(1) One graduate student from each training area will participate in general faculty meetings as a non-voting member.

(2) Graduate students may be voting or non-voting members of area committees. The form of graduate student participation is to be determined by the individual areas.

(3) One graduate student will participate as a non-voting member of the Committee of Area Chairmen.

(4) Undergraduate students may participate as members of the Committee on Undergraduate Education. The form of their participation shall be determined by the faculty members of the committee.

(5) Student members of the above Committees will be selected by a vote of their peers.

(6) The Chairman with the advice of the Executive Committee may include students in his appointed committees.

VI. Revisions of these Procedures and Rules

A. These rules may be revised by a 2/3 vote of the faculty present at a regular faculty meeting.

(1) Proposed changes may be submitted to the Executive Committee by any member of the faculty for discussion.

(2) Following such discussion the Executive Committee will make a recommendation to the faculty for approval of the change as

submitted, for approval of the change with alterations or for disapproval.

(3) The proposed change and a recommendation of the Executive Committee will be submitted to the faculty as a part of the agenda announced for a forthcoming meeting.

VII. Guidelines in Areas Not Covered by These Rules

It is the responsibility of the Chairman, with the advice of the Executive Committee, to develop policy guidelines in areas not covered by these rules. Such guidelines shall be submitted to the faculty for approval. A simple majority vote shall be required for their adoption. Copies of these guidelines shall be kept on file in the Departmental office where they will be available for inspection by any faculty member. Proposals to change such guidelines shall be made to the Chairman in writing. The Chairman will submit such proposals to the faculty for decision, after discussion with the Executive Committee, if such discussion seems to him to be required.

Amendments

(1) Consideration of nepotism shall not be used as a criterion with regard to academic appointments in the Department of Psychology at the University of Colorado.

GUIDELINE REGARDING UNDERGRADUATE COMPLAINTS

During the course of the current academic year we have had several undergraduate student complaints about unfair treatment. Usually the complaint is made when the student feels that this treatment has led to a lower grade than might otherwise have been awarded.

Before preceeding let me say other undergraduates complain about grades they receive but do not argue that the grade is based upon unfair treatment. Such matters are clearly to be handled by the instructor in the course and are not included in the policy dealt with in this memo. To the extent that complaints in this category have broader implications, e.g., influencing graduation, the student should be referred for counseling to the Director of Undergraduate Studies.

Hopefully all cases in which charges of unfair treatment are made will be handled by the instructor in the course; it is the intructor's responsibility to make every reasonable effort to handle such matters directly. If such efforts fail the student should be referred to the Director of Undergraduate Studies. However, if such a referral is made in the absence of effort by the instructor to deal with the student, the Director of Undergraduate Studies will return the student to the instructor for discussion of the problem.

Following appropriate referral, the Director of Undergraduate Studies will review the complaint with the student and if the charge involves matters which are specific enough to be checked, he will ask that the complaint be put in writing. When he receives the written complaint he, in company with the instructor in the course, will check the student's complaints as objectively as possible. At this point he may ask the instructor to supply a written statement for his use. If he feels the complaints are justified he will inform the student in writing to this effect. If he feels they are justified, he will work out a remedy with the instructor. In the event the two disagree with respect to the degree of justification for the complaints, the Department Chairman will be included in the decision about the action to be taken.

Although we may never need to put this procedure into effect, the fact that we have it will give us assurance that each undergraduate student has available to him an orderly process of appeal in cases where he feels he has been unfairly treated and is unable to obtain satisfaction from the instructor against whom his complaint is directed.

GUIDELINE ON FACULTY CONFLICT

Preferably, conflicts among faculty members should be worked out directly by the people directly involved. If this is not possible, a faculty member wishing to make a formal complaint against any other faculty member should do so to the Department Chairman. Normally, the Chairman will first bring together those faculty members directly involved in the complaint, for the purpose of determining whether the complaint is legitimate and whether it can be dealt with adequately at that level. At the discretion of the Chairman, he may ask the Executive Committee or some specially appointed individual or subcommittee to meet with the faculty parties to the complaint and attempt to resolve it.

If the above procedures fail to resolve the complaint, and if the Chairman or whoever is assigned to mediate the complaint judge it to require further investigation, the Chairman will ask that the complaint and bases for it be submitted in writing. After receiving the written complaint, the Chairman will consult with and provide a copy thereof to the faculty member(s) against whom the complaint is being made, and try to investigate this complaint as completely and objectively as possible. The Chairman may in the course of this investigation also ask for a written statement from the faculty member(s) against whom the complaint is being made, or from other parties involved in the complaint.

If the foregoing investigation indicates the complaint to be justified and/or that some remedial action should be taken, the Chairman will either refer the matter to the Executive Committee for decision and action, or may appoint a special committee to handle the problem. Should either of the parties to the complaint be dissatisfied and wish to appeal the committee decision, a departmental faculty meeting will be called to discuss the complaint and the decision made concerning it.

Should the complaint be made against the Department Chairman, it should be referred immediately to one or more members of the Executive Committee, and the above procedures will be carried out directly by the members of the Executive Committee rather than by the Chairman.

GUIDELINE WITH RESPECT TO SALARY COMPETITION WITH OTHER UNIVERSITIES

Several recent events have made us again aware of the dilemma posed by high salaries offered by other universities either to current faculty members or to faculty members in the process of recruitment. The first type of event is familiar enough; the second, while less frequent, arises when an individual we are recruiting is simultaneously offered a salary by another university to which he is considering moving.

In recent years we have discussed the steps we should take when we encounter competitive salary offers. In each case the discussion has resulted in a conclusion that we could not survive in our effort to build a first-class department unless we made salary offers equal to those of other universities. We have agreed that a failure to take this position would mean that we would have to settle for persons less competent than those being attracted by better departments. It has seemed unlikely to us that our determination to work toward top quality could survive this state of affairs.

The policy of the Department of Psychology is to meet the salary competition of other universities within limits permitted by the University administration.

Nevertheless, it seems necessary to determine in each case whether or not the faculty believes that policy should, in fact, be followed. This recognizes the possibility that for some current faculty member or for some potential recruit, the desire to keep or the desire to acquire may not be strong enough to warrant further dislocation of our salary framework. Since no one other than the faculty as a whole can make this determination in specific cases, it will be necessary for the Chairman to consult the faculty each time such a circumstance arises. It should be noted that this is not equivalent to re-raising the general policy on each such occasion. Rather, granted that the general policy is to compete in salary terms, the consultation is to determine the application of the policy in the specific case.

The consultation with the faculty will proceed as follows:

After the faculty member receives an offer from another university <u>in writing</u>, the Chairman will ask the appropriate Area Committee for an evaluation of the scientific and professional reputation of the faculty member and of his contributions to the work of the Department. The Area Committee will meet and determine its advice to the Chairman. The Chairman will formulate a recommendation for action based upon all the factors available, including the Area Committee's evaluation and the quality of the competing university. He will present this recommendation to the Executive Committee, augmented for the occasion by the Chairman of the Area Committee. The Executive Committee will act upon the Chairman's recommendation, either endorsing or modifying it.

Basing his actions upon the above consultation, the Chairman will negotiate with the faculty member. He will involve the Dean, either before or after this negotiation, as seems appropriate in terms of the circumstances of the particular case.

Another question has to do with the realignment of the salary framework dislocated as a result of following a policy of meeting salary offers by others. (Aside from the influence of competitive salary offers the salary framework is determined by considerations such as are taken into account on the occasion of promotions and reappointment with tenure, e.g., length of service, teaching reputation, administrative contributions, publications, participation in scientific meetings, etc.). The opinion most often expressed by the faculty is that the act of meeting higher salaries will have the effect of upgrading generally the salaries of all faculty in the Department. The fact that average salaries differ in the University from department to department, and that the difference is in favor of those departments where personnel are scarce and the demand is high, supports this view. However, even though this is true we still have to face the question or realignment within the Department. In this respect it has been the salary policy in the Department in the last several years to realign the salary framework to the extent that this was made possible by salary increase money awarded annually to the Department. Sometimes the funds available have been so limited that little or no realignment was possible. At other times more could be done. Specifically, this means that persons whose salaries have been raised by an unusual amount in order to meet a salary offer elsewhere will receive no increases or lower than average increases in the years immediately following. Conversely, those who have not benefited from such an event will receive relatively higher increases during that period.

At the time funds are made available for annual salary increases the Department will attempt to minimize distortions in salary framework by giving relatively higher increases to persons unaffected by salary competition and relatively lower increases to those who have benefited from such competition.

It is obvious that perhaps it should be made explicit that the paragraph immediately above refers only to correction of <u>distortions</u> in relative salary. To the extent that higher salaries resulting, in part, from salary competition would also have been achieved in terms of other criteria, no salary distortion will be present and no correction needed.

GUIDELINE FOR ELECTION OF DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRMAN

It is important the a chairman of the department be acceptable to all training areas of the department. For that reason area-by-area input should be available at the time voting on the chairmanship takes place. To provide for such input there should be area meetings prior to such a faculty meeting to discuss candidates and the results of this discussion should be presented by each area.

At the same time differences in the sizes of our training areas suggest that no fixed majority should be required of each area for the election of a chairman. This would mean that one or two people from a small area could block the election of a chairman under some circumstances. Requiring a three-fourths vote of the faculty to elect a chairman seems to provide strong enough protection for substantial minority opinion.

GUIDELINE FOR APPOINTMENT OF AREA CHAIRMEN

According to departmental procedures the chairman of a training area is to be appointed by the chairman of the department. The logic of this rule is that the departmental chairman and the area chairmen must work together effectively on many basic problems. It is important that procedures not allow a situation to develop where these two people are in continual conflict.

At the same time the area chairman must represent his area's interests accurately and effectively. For this reason our procedures must not allow a situation to develop where the area chairman would be in conflict with major segments of area faculty. The aim of this guideline is to assure the appointment of an area chairman who will be mutually acceptable to the area and the chairman of the department.

To this end the departmental chairman should proceed in two stages in appointing area chairmen: (1) he should select possible candidates only after discussing the situation with members of the area.
(2) he should make his final selection after further discussion with faculty of the area.

GUIDELINE ON RELEASE TIME

Faculty members of the Department of Psychology are normally expected to teach two courses per semester, an undergraduate course and a graduate course. In the past, release time from these teaching responsibilities, in some cases, has been without consultation with appropriate members of the Department and without due consideration for Departmental needs. This practice and the absence of consistent guidelines have resulted in inequities in release time and assumption of Departmental responsibilities. In order to rectify this situation, release time shall be negotiated by the individual faculty member, with the Chairman, in consultation with the Executive Committee, the individual's Area Chairman, the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Director of Graduate Studies.

The obtaining of funds by a faculty member from research or other agencies to carry out activities normally required of faculty members will not in and of itself merit release time from teaching and other Departmental responsibilities. In those instances in which a reduced teaching load is approved, the reduction normally will not exceed two courses per academic year.

TO: FACULTY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

FROM: CHAIRMAN OF DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

Over the years this department has evolved a set of procedures intended to guarantee that full information is available to the faculty regarding each action we take for reappointment and promotion. The procedures seem excellent and I have revised them only slightly.

The first step is a request to the individual involved to bring his personnel file up to date. Will you examine the materials which are now in (secretary's) hands and supply me with anything in addition which you feel should be considered. No limits are set on the type of information to be considered relevant. Indications of success in teaching, supervising student research, service to the Department other than through teaching, scholarly publications, professional activities, participation in scientific meetings, etc. are examples of things which the committee should know about.

It would be a great help to me if you would organize the material in your personnel folder so that it will be possible to see the following:

1. A complete list of dissertations and theses directed.
2. A complete list of publications.
3. A reprint of each publication (unless unavailable, in which case a note to this effect).
4. A list of unpublished papers in press.
5. A list of unpublished papers submitted for publication, to whom and approximately when.
6. A list of studies completed and in process of being written.
7. A few sentences describing foci of research concentration at present and in the future.
8. A complete list of conferences attended and fellowships held.
9. A list of recent addresses, if any. Include colloquia given in the last two or three years.
10. A list of recent conventions attended, including program participation.
11. A complete list of honors received (scholastic, distinguished teaching awards, etc.).

12. Professional and organizational activities outside the University (A.P.A., regional, state association offices and responsibilities, research advisory groups, professional advisory groups, editorial boards, etc.).

13. If you have additional information about student reaction to your teaching, I would suggest adding this to your personnel folder also.

14. Departmental service activities (committee chairmanships, committee memberships, activities in assistance of area committees, etc.)

15. University service activities (committee chairmanships, committee memberships, etc.)

16. Names of three persons outside the Department familiar with your professional work to whom the Chairman may write for letters of recommendation.

In many cases this degree of detail will be unnecessary to the Department in making a decision. There are two justifications for following this procedure in all cases, nevertheless. The first is to impersonalize the procedure internal to the Department and thus eliminate any questions regarding all cases receiving equal and full attention. The second is to provide a basis for justification at decision-making levels outside the Department where other faculty and administrative personnel must make decisions in the absence of personal information about the individual being considered. This is where outside letters may sometimes be useful. In the event our machinery seems tedious and unnecessary to you, I hope you will keep these points in mind.

You will understand, I am sure, that this action represents only the first step in the decision-making process. Following the review by the Department it will then determine whether a recommendation for reappointment or promotion should be made. Should the decision be in the affirmative the matter will then be reviewed by the Dean of the College and his advisory council.

This letter is more detailed than is usually necessary. The situation was unusual, however, and obtaining approval seemed likely to require careful documentation.

Dear Dean

The Department of Psychology recommends Dr. currently Assistant Professor of Psychology at the University of , for the academic rank of Associate Professor with continuous tenure. The recommendation for tenure represents the fulfillment of an obligation incurred at the time of original appointment. A copy of the offering letter, written by me but signed by Dr. in my absence is enclosed.

In order to document the case for our recommendation, I will review Dr. contributions in the following areas: 1) scholarly activity, including publication, 2) service to the Department, 3) teaching, 4) national reputation as a scholar, and 5) service outside of the university community.

1) The results of scholarly activity are quite substantial. While the publication list offered in support of our recommendation is not as long as those of some other faculty members at the same stage of their careers, publications tend to be of very high quality. has published ten papers, eight of which are in carefully refereed, high-quality, journals. One additional high quality paper has been submitted for publication and three additional papers are in preparation, two of which have been slated for preliminary presentation before conferences and meetings this spring. A book is underway, jointly authored with one of the more eminent psychologists in the country, Professor of the University of

Substantial research results have been reported by Dr. in his published papers. These results are of two kinds: empirical research on human learning and conceptual problem solving and mathematical analyses of formal properties of performance in human learning. His more recent activities include the development of formal computer languages for computer controlled experimental work in psychology. This work is a major contribution as the letter (attached) from mentions.

The rate of output by of scientific research has increased with time. The last two years have marked a substantial increase of activity. Recent success in obtaining a research grant, as well as positive preliminary reports on other research grant applications, forecast a heightened degree of opportunity for future contributions.

A final indication of the importance of . contribution to research in this department is the following: seven members of the department (all belonging to the Institute for the Study of Behavior) applied some time back for an NSF grant under a new program that supports "coherent areas of research." is one of that group. Recently we received a site visit and were asked to submit a budget at the level of $200,000 for an initial year and approximately $180,000 for subsequent years. In the case of NSF, this is tantamount to a promise of support at this level. I was very much impressed during the visit with the fact that no one questioned the appropriateness of the equipment budget (about $50,000) developed by Dr. The general reaction seemed to be that this equipment would contribute in essential ways to the coherence of the proposed research.

2) service contributions to the Department are significant, particularly in view of his relatively brief association with the University of He has served on three committees: a) Psychology Area Committee, b) Committee on Undergraduate Education, and c) Minority Admissions Committee. He has contributed significantly on each committee, but especially the Committee on Undergraduate Education. The other members of this committee uniformly praise his contribution to the Department's undergraduate education policy and action. In addition to committee service, he has contributed to the operation of the Departmental Laboratory for Psychological Research as the Assistant Director of the Laboratory. Evidence regarding his contribution to that Laboratory, and its contribution to our graduate and undergraduate research and instructional programs, is contained in the attached supporting letters from Professors , all of this Department.

Letters of recommendation obtained by the Department prior to our offer to him of a position indicated a strong service motivation and activity. Our observations of Dr. confirm this. Therefore, in addition to his scholarly activity, we anticipate that he will continue to play an important part in the research and training activities of other persons in the Department over the future years. His teaching record here, as testified to below, indicates that this service motivation extends to his teaching activities and contributes to his record of being a good teacher. As his teaching experience matures, this service motivation should prove to be the basis for an outstanding career as a teacher.

3) record as a teacher at the University of consists of full-time teaching duties over the past three semesters. During that time, he has gained a reputation as a top-flight instructor. The faculty committee that prepared a complete review of activities and accomplishments also made a number of inquiries into his teaching reputation and the impact of his teaching on the activities of his students. Individual students provided completely positive information, in the view of the committee. In his other work, has gained a great deal of admiration and respect of his students. He has the reputation of being a stimulating teacher demanding just the right amount of hard work to make his courses exciting and productive. The actual product of this work is quite visible in the Department, with a relatively large number of students continuing the research activities initiated during a course they took from him. Formal evidence of student reaction is available. He has obtained student ratings, using both the "University of Course Evaluation Procedures" and essay evaluations by the students in his courses. In the formal course evaluation procedures rated a full standard deviation above the average rating of faculty members in the Department and approximately the same number of rating points above the general faculty of the University (placing him in the top third on the faculty). Comments made in writing (anonymously) by his students include: "Excellent quality", "A very worthwhile course--I feel I have learned a lot", "The best organized psychology class that I have had," "You have a rare talent for understanding the student's questions, and giving an intelligent answer," "You are the most enthusiastic, exciting teacher I have every had," "Overall, you are one of the better teachers at . Students in one class were asked to assign letter grades to the quality of instruction in the course. The "GPA" earned by was 3.7, with no grade less than a B+.

Two courses now taught as integral portions of our Laboratory and Psychology graduate curriculum can be taught only by The need for a teacher for these courses, Psychology and Psychology was used explicitly as a criterion for recruitment when was recruited. will continue to fill the need for offering these required courses.

4) In order to assess national reputation among advanced and highly thought of psychologists around the country working in fields similar to that in which is working, we obtained a letter from a recognized psychologist in that field, Professor of University. Recently, was requested to review the scholarly work of for the National Institutes of Health in connection with a grant application made by A copy of letter is attached. That letter, along with the three letters we obtained prior to offering his current position, also attached,

are clear evidence of a good national reputation, although he began his academic career only six years ago. This fact, combined with his naturally high level of activity and scholarly vigor appear to assure that will attain widespread academic recognition as a scholar and scientist.

5) : has not been a member of the community long enough for us to evaluate his potential contribution to non-academic affairs. However, his interest in and participation on the Minority Student Recruitment Committee suggests that community participation may be a component in his future activity. He has expressed an interest in assisting persons outside of his own immediate environment. For example, he has recently served as a consultant at University regarding the establishment of a psychology facility.

Finally, a comment or two regarding his personal qualities as they might play a role in determining the award of continuous tenure. is a warm and personally appealing person. He makes acquaintances readily, and many members of the faculty have a high personal regard for him.

In summary, the Department urges that Dr. be awarded continuous tenure and be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor of Psychology.

Respectfully,

Chairman

RECOMMENDED UNIVERSITY STANDARDS, PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES IN MAKING APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, CONTINUOUS TENURE, AND PROMOTION RECOMMENDATIONS ON ALL CAMPUSES, IN ALL SCHOOLS & COLLEGES

I. General Provisions

A. Definitions

Since organizational differences exist among the various schools and colleges, it is not desirable to compose uniform standards, processes and procedures with respect to appointment, reappointment, continuous tenure, and promotion. Thus, a school or college having a small faculty might in many ways function as a department does within a larger school or college. In order to make the recommendations as general in application as possible and in order to avoid the use of certain terms, e.g., department, in ways that may mislead, the following terminology has been adopted:

1. "Primary Unit": This term refers to the unit composed of professional colleagues most directly involved with the candidate and having authority to make recommendations concerning appointment, reappointment, continuous tenure, and promotion. In schools and colleges with departmental organizations each department will usually constitute a Primary Unit. In a school or college without such organization all full-time faculty members shall have the responsibility for developing the terms of their own working structure whereby the Primary Unit is defined. The Primary Unit might be a division, or might be the school or college as a whole. In some instances the Primary Unit may involve cognate departments or institutes. The dean of the school or college shall be informed in writing of the determined structure of the Primary Unit.

2. "Evaluation Committee": This term refers to the group within the Primary Unit that is delegated by the Primary Unit the responsibility of initially reviewing the qualifications of candidates for appointment, reappointment, continuous tenure, and promotion. In a small Primary Unit, it is possible that all members of the Unit will constitute such a committee.

3. "First Level Review": This term refers to the dean of the school or college to which the recommendations of the Primary Unit are taken. Without regard to the size of the school or college, the dean shall not participate as a member of the Primary Unit but rather shall carry out the independent duties of office specified by the Board of Regents.

4. "Review Committee": This term refers to the faculty group which assists in the review level procedures.

B. Every Primary Unit and reviewing body shall promulgate the procedures to be followed and standards to be applied in making recommendations concerning appointment, reappointment, continuous tenure, and promotion. Such procedures and standards shall be consistent with those described in Section I, II, and III hereof, and shall be in writing and be available to the candidate being evaluated, as well as to all other persons involved in the candidate's evaluation.

1. Multi-campus units, schools or colleges shall organize in a way consistent with I-A1 above. The relevant chief academic officer in the review process in these cases shall be the individual on whose campus the position is rostered.

II. Primary Unit

A. Standards

1. In making appointment, reappointment, continuous tenure and/or promotion recommendation, all Primary Units shall take into account the following criteria:

a. The teaching ability of the candidate.

b. The scholarly, creative, and/or research work of the candidate.

c. The University service and public service of the candidate.

The Primary Unit may take into account other criteria (such as the need of the unit, school, or college) that have a rational bearing on an appointment, reappointment, continuous tenure, or promotion recommendation of that unit.

2. As early as possible within the first year of the faculty member's initial term of appointment and frequently thereafter, the Primary Unit shall advise every candidate for reappointment, promotion, and/or continuous tenure about all of the criteria and standards that the unit recognizes in reaching a decision regarding the candidate's performance.

3. Since the granting of continuous tenure is an expression of confidence on the part of the University in the present and future ability of an individual to contribute significantly to teaching, scholarship, and University and public service, and since most tenure recommendations are a result of earlier decisions involving appointments and reappointments, it is imperative that rigorous criteria and standards be used in making all recommendations.

B. Evaluation Committee

1. For the purpose of assisting the Primary Unit in making its recommendations on appointment, reappointment, continuous tenure,

and/or promotion, it is recommended that each Primary Unit elect or appoint (having previously voted on the method to be followed) from among its members an Evaluation Committee for each candidate or for all candidates being considered during an academic year. The committees may consist of both tenured and nontenured members. It is recognized that there is good reason for a committee to consist of solely tenured members in the event that the recommendation to be made is a continuous tenure recommendation. Such committees shall take into account and carefully evaluate the following:

a. Information concerning the teaching ability of the candidate including the opinions of the candidate's students and colleagues and other qualified individuals who may have observed the candidate's classroom presentations;

b. the candidate's scholarly, creative and/or research efforts, including the opinions of his colleagues relative thereto and his written publications which the committee should thoroughly examine;

c. opinions of others in the candidate's field or in cognate fields who have particular knowledge of the candidate's scholarly, creative and/or research efforts;

d. the candidate's University and public service including the opinion of his colleagues and others relative thereto;

e. any other information submitted by the candidate that the candidate believes will assure an adequate consideration and evaluation of his appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or continuous tenure.

2. The committee shall conduct further investigation and evaluation as it or its unit deems appropriate. The investigation and evaluation may include:

a. The opinions of members of other units within the University community who are competent to judge the candidate and have a legitimate interest in the appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or continuous tenure recommendation.

b. The opinions in writing of scholars from outside the University and from various locations who are qualified to judge the candidate.

3. After diligently pursuing the procedures outlined above, the Evaluation Committee shall report its findings concerning appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or continuous tenure to the Primary Unit or the committee of the unit which acts on behalf of the unit. The Primary Unit or committee thereof shall then make its recommendation on

appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or continuous tenure according to its established rules for making such a recommendation.

a. A candidate for reappointment or continuous tenure and/or one for whom a recommendation to promote was made shall be verbally informed of the recommendation by the head of the Primary Unit as expeditiously as possible.

4. It is the responsibility of the head of the Primary Unit making the recommendation to prepare a comprehensive dossier on the candidate for submission to the group or individual making both the First and Second Level Review. Normally the dossier shall include the following materials:

a. Evidence concerning the teaching ability of the candidate, including, if available, results of student evaluations.

b. A description and evaluation of the candidate's scholarly and creative work, research and service to the University and/or community.

c. A statement describing the procedures followed and actions taken by the unit making the recommendation, including the reasons for the recommendation and any dissenting statements from the recommendation. This statement must include the results of any vote taken.

d. An explanation, in the case of a new appointment, of why the unit would benefit by adding a member who has expertise in the area of the candidate.

e. The details, in the case of a new appointment, of the search procedure that yielded the name of the candidate and detailed evidence that a diligent and sincere effort was made to locate qualified women and minority candidates.

III. Review

Review Committee

The dean of each school or college shall have a Review Committee to aid in the evaluation of recommendations forwarded by the Primary Unit. Where it is not possible for the Review Committee to consist of faculty members other than those in the Primary Unit or its committee thereof, the dean shall form a Review Committee which shall include faculty from other schools or colleges. The dean may opt for the election or appointment of the committee.

A. The Review Committee will participate fully with the dean in the review of the recommendations of the Primary Units. Such participation shall include discussion prior to forwarding the recommendations of the dean and the Review Committee to the chief academic officer of any reasons

for disagreement between the dean and the majority position of the Review Committee. Should either the Review Committee or the dean disagree with the recommendation of the Primary Unit, the dean shall discuss the nature of this disagreement with the head of the Primary Unit. The Primary Unit shall then reconsider its original recommendation and return its reconsidered judgment to the dean for his consideration and that of his Review Committee.

The recommendation of the dean, the results of the votes of the Primary Unit and the Review Committee, and the comprehensive dossier on the candidate shall be forwarded together to the chief academic officer.

1. A candidate for reappointment, promotion, and/or continuous tenure shall be verbally informed of this set of recommendations as expeditiously as possible by the head of the Primary Unit who shall have been given the information by the dean.

B. If the recommendation of the dean and the majority recommendation of the Review Committee are in agreement and if the chief academic officer disagrees with these recommendations, he shall transmit to the dean of the school or college the nature of the disagreement. The dean and the Review Committee shall then reconsider their recommendation and return their reconsidered judgment(s) to the chief academic officer. The chief academic officer shall make his final recommendation under these circumstances only after the completion of this process.

1. A candidate for reappointment, promotion, and/or continuous tenure shall be informed of the final recommendation of the chief academic officer as expeditiously as possible and prior to any submission of a recommendation to the Board of Regents.

C. Candidate's Rights

1. A candidate shall be entitled to submit any material or information that he believes will be helpful in evaluating his reappointment, promotion, and/or continuous tenure at either or both of the First Level Review and Second Level Review stages.

2. If a candidate so requests, in a confidential conversation, the chief academic officer or his representative shall advise him of the reasons which contributed to a recommendation not to reappoint or grant continuous tenure or to a reversal of a Primary Unit's recommendation to promote.

3. A candidate shall be entitled to appeal to the Privilege and Tenure Committee if the candidate feels that the procedures described herein have not been observed at any stage of the recommending or review process. The candidate may also appeal any other matter deemed by the candidate to entitle him to a reversal or reconsideration of the recommendation made, by appeal to the Privilege and Tenure Committee. Written procedures to be distributed pursuant to I-B

above, shall include a reference to the right to appeal to the Privilege and Tenure Committee. Procedural errors per se, however, shall never be used as the justification for personnel actions not otherwise justified on the basis of performance and need. Nor is it intended that the Privilege and Tenure Committee substitute its judgment about an individual's merit for that of other committees and administrators.

db